FEBRUARY 1954
VOL. III No. 2

TAXON

Official News Bulletin of the International Association for Plant Taxonomy, Edited and Published for I.A.P.T. by the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht, Netherlands

Proposals for Modification of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature

A. British Botanists

Proposals nos 99-119

The following proposals have been discussed and unanimously approved by members of the staffs of the Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew and of the Department of Botany, British Museum (Natural History), London. Some of these proposals are intended simply to make the wording of the Code clearer and more precise and it is suggested that the best way of dealing at Paris with such proposals will be to refer them to the Editorial Committee without discussion so that more time can be given to more fundamental matters. Where more than one proposal to amend a particular article is submitted these proposals are independent in that any one can be passed or rejected without prejudicing the decision on any other.

Proposal no. 99

Art. 7

Proposal: Delete the last sentence of the Article and insert it as Recommendation 7A.

Argument: This sentence has the form of a Recommendation and is so worded that names or forms contrary to it cannot be rejected. It should therefore be a Recommendation and not part of an Article. This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: R. Ross.

Proposal no. 100

Art. 7

Proposal: Add at the end of the Article the following: 'In names taken from languages other than Latin the consonants *k*, *w* and *y* may be used in addition to the letters found in classical Latin. No other letters, nor any diacritic signs, are permitted in botanical Latin, but the diaeresis sign may be used where required, e.g. *Cephaëlis* not *Cephaelis*.'

This addition will require the following consequential amendments:

In Article 82 add as Note 5 'The use of letters foreign to botanical latin or of diacritic signs, is to be regarded as an orthographic error, and such letters are to be transcribed and the signs suppressed. (See Article 7).'

In Recommendation 82 B (c) delete the second and fourth sentences and add '(See Art. 7)'.

In Recommendation 82 C (c) delete the second and fourth sentences and add '(See Art. 7)'.

Argument: As the rules stand at present it is possible to deduce from Recommendations 82 B (c) and 82 C (c), although without much certainty, which letters should and which should not be used in botanical Latin, but there is no Article which expressly permits the consonant use of *y* and the use of *k* and *w*, nor any which forbids such others as the Scandinavian ø. The use of diacritic signs also is not expressly forbidden. The proposal made above effects this without affecting the legality of names published with an unacceptable spelling. The proposed amendments to Recom-

mendations 82 B and 82 C remove from them matter which it is here proposed to include in Article 7 or 82.

Proposed by: J. P. M. Brenan.

Proposal no. 101

Art. 16

Proposal: At the end of the first paragraph add: — 'and for certain fungi (see Art. 69)'.

Argument: Without this addition there is a conflict between this Article and Article 69, for under Article 69 alternative generic names may be used for the perfect and imperfect states of the same species of fungus. This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: F. L. Balfour-Browne.

Proposal no. 102

Art. 16

Proposal: In the third line, for '9 families in which' read '9 families for which'.

Argument: The present wording suggests that alternative names are permitted for subordinate taxa within the families mentioned, whereas it is for the families themselves that alternative names are permitted, and the amended wording proposed above makes this clear. This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: R. Ross.

Proposal no. 103

Art. 34

Proposal: Insert as a paragraph between the fourth and fifth paragraphs: — 'Certain epithets specified in Article 80 may not be used for infraspecific taxa [except as provided in that Article].'

Argument: Without this cross-reference this Article does not give a comprehensive account of the way in which the names of infraspecific taxa may, and may not, be formed, although it purports to do so. The phrase in square brackets is needed if the proposal to amend Article 80 is accepted. This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: R. Ross.

Proposal no. 104

Art. 38

Proposal: Replace the last sentence by: — 'Detailed regulations for the nomenclature of such plants appear in the *International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants* (London, 1953).'

Argument: Appendix III of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (1952) contains the provisional text of the International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants which was adopted at Stockholm in 1950 as subject to reconsideration and emendation at the International Horticultural Congress, London, 1952. The approved official text of this supplementary code resulting from the 1952 Congress has now been published by the Royal Horticultural Society, Vincent Square, London, S. W. 7, both as a pamphlet (price, 1 shilling; postage, 3d.) and as part of the Report of the Thirteenth International Horticultural Congress (vol. 1: 54-68); it automatically supersedes the provisional text of Appendix III and the wording of Article 38 should be amended accordingly.

This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: W. T. Stearn.

Proposal no. 105

Art. 39

Proposal: Replace first sentence by: — 'Publication is effected, under this Code, only by sale of printed matter to the general public or by adequate distribution of it (through sale, exchange or gift) among botanical institutions.'

Argument: The present first sentence of the Article reads 'Publication is effected, under this Code, only by distribution (sale, exchange or gift) of printed matter.' Whatever may have been the intention at Stockholm, this sentence is manifestly inadequate, for its provisions are far too lax and do not ensure the essential characteristic of publication, i.e. the making available of information for common use by the botanical public. For example, according to the wording of this sentence, any botanist could purchase a child's printing outfit, print a few copies of anything he liked to say, give these away to anyone at random, and by doing this secure effective publication. An actual example is afforded by the *Cartas* of the Spanish botanist Carlos Pau, who during the years 1904 to 1907 compiled a series of annotations (including names of proposed new taxa, new combinations, etc.) on plants

collected in Spain by the French botanist-collector Reverchon. Pau had these annotations printed in four parts, in the form of letters, each commencing "Sr. D . . . ." [completed by hand] and entitled *Carta á un botánico*. These letters were apparently printed for private circulation to Pau's botanical friends in Spain and Italy (the nature of the contents is such that one could scarcely expect them to have been sent to any French botanist!). They were not put on sale nor distributed to botanical institutions. Indeed they (and printed matter of similar type) can only become available to the botanical public if passed on by the recipients to botanical institutions; and this may never happen. It is desirable therefore that the wording of the Article should exclude such matter from the category of 'effective publication'.

The sentence here proposed for substitution in the Article is similar to that in the pre-Stockholm Rules (Art. 36), except that the phrase 'adequate distribution .... among botanical institutions' is used in place of 'distribution .... to specified representative botanical institutions' (with footnote referring to a list of such institutions which was never published). As it seems to be impossible to frame a rigid completely satisfactory definition of effective publication, and as lists (which never see the light of day) appear to be undesirable, it is felt that the word 'adequate', interpreted with common sense of what is meant, will provide the required safeguard.

Proposed by: J. E. Dandy.

Proposal no. 106

Art. 48

Proposal: Insert in this Article after the words 'other subdivision of a genus' the following: — 'The description mentioned in (2) and (3) must be in Latin if published on or after 1 Jan. 1935'. Add as a note 'The citation of a description or diagnosis published on or after 1 Jan. 1935 does not validate the publication of a new generic name unless the description or diagnosis concerned was in Latin'.

Argument: The addition of such a provision as the above is necessary to make fully explicit in the Code the intention of Article 44, which is that the names of all taxa of recent plants, the bacteria excepted, first described after 1 Jan. 1935 should be associated with a Latin description for international convenience. As the Code is at present worded, a botanical "lawyer" could effectively publish a description of a new taxon in, say, Armenian, Gaelic, Hausa, Hebrew, Maori, or any language other than Latin, and then a short time afterwards validly publish a new name merely by citing this previously and effectively published non-Latin description. Obviously this rather dishonest procedure would be contrary to the spirit of the Code and detrimental to taxonomic botany as an international science and it should be clearly declared illegitimate by a statement such as the above.

Proposed by: W. T. Stearn.

Proposal no. 107

Arts 50 & 52

Proposal: For 'a plate with' in Article 50 and 'a plate or figure with' in Article 52, read: — 'an illustration with'.

Argument: Since the words 'or figure' are omitted in Article 50 of the current Code, it would appear that where an illustration is a text-figure or is accompanied on a plate by illustrations of one or more other species, it is insufficient to validate the name of a monotypic new genus although it is sufficient to validate the name of a new species. There seems no reason for this difference and this Article has normally been interpreted as if it were worded like Article 52. The use of the word 'illustration' in both Articles covers all cases unequivocally.

Proposed by: R. Ross.

Proposal no. 108

Arts 50 & 52

Proposal: In both Articles for 'analyses' read 'analysis'.

Argument: In some cases only a single analytical figure, e.g. a longitudinal section of a flower, has been provided, and it shows all necessary details. Such cases are regarded as covered by these provisions but without this amendment they are not strictly sufficient.

Proposed by: J. E. Dandy.

Proposal no. 109

Arts 50 & 52

Proposal: As a footnote to 'a plate [or figure] with analyses' or that phrase as amended, insert: — 'Single figures of microscopic plants showing the details necessary for identification are to be included in this definition.'

Argument: A single figure of the whole plant, if sufficiently magnified and detailed, portrays all the characters of a microscopical plant, and additional illustrations of single parts (analyses) would add nothing. Such single figures, if published early enough to be covered by this provision, have always been held to validate the names of monotypic new genera and of new species, although strictly speaking they do not comply with the provisions of these articles.

Proposed by: R. Ross.

The three proposals made above have been put forward to make the letter of the law consistent with present practice without admitting as valid anything not now normally so regarded.

Proposal no. 110

Art. 51

Proposal: For 'subdivisions of genera .... and specific names,' substitute: — 'taxa below the rank of genus are not validly published unless the names'.

Argument: In view of the definition of a 'subdivision of a genus' given as a footnote to the title of Section 4, subsection 4, of the code, this article is so worded that it does not include the epithets of species, for it must be assumed that the 'of species' in the first line is parallel with 'of genera' and not with 'of subdivisions of genera' because of the otherwise irrelevant mention of specific names in the second line. This interpretation is, however, at variance with the examples. On the alternative assumption that 'of species' is to be regarded as parallel with 'of subdivisions of genera', epithets of infraspecific taxa are not covered by this article and the words 'and specific' in the second line are meaningless. It is suggested that the Editorial Committee, when rewording Hylander's proposal (Syn. Prop., Stockholm, Art. 43ter), meant it to refer to all taxa below generic rank, but if it is to do so an amendment similar to that proposed above is necessary.

Proposed by: A. A. Bullock.

Proposal no. 111

Art. 52

Proposal: Insert in this Article after the words 'a previously and effectively published description of it' the following: — 'which description must be in Latin if published on or after 1 Jan. 1935'. Add as a note: — 'The citation of a description or diagnosis published on or after 1 Jan. 1935 does not validate the publication of a new specific or infraspecific name unless the description or diagnosis cited was in Latin'.

Argument: The addition of some such provision as the above is necessary to make fully explicit the intention of Article 44. See discussion above under Article 48.

Proposed by: W. T. Stearn.

Proposal no. 112

Arts 64, 65 & 66

Proposal: In all three Articles, in (2) for 'validly published' substitute 'legitimate'.

Argument: The present wording of these Articles is carried over from the 1935 Code in which 'validly published' is often used in the sense of 'legitimate' as defined in Article 10 of the current Code. Under these Articles, as at present worded, epithets originally published as *nomina superflua* or as later homonyms must be adopted if they are the earliest available and are not barred under (1). This is contrary to Article 53, second para., and to Article 73, second para. It is these latter Articles which represent the views of the last Congress.

Note: 'validly published' is the correct wording in Article 64, para. 1, and Article 66, para. 1.

This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: R. D. Meikle.

Proposal no. 113

Art. 66

Proposal: After para. (2) add: '(3) that the resulting combination falls under Article 35.'

Argument: This is as necessary a consequential amendment as the analogous provision in Article 64. Without it this Article and Article 35 would give different results when a subdivision of a species was transferred to another species whose type it included. This proposal follows the wording of Art. 64 (3) but it would be preferable if that provision and the proposed new one in Art. 66 read '(3) that Art. 32 [or 35] provides that another epithet be used'. This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: R. Ross.

Proposal no. 114

Art. 73

Proposal: In (7) between 'Art.' and '79' insert '35,'.

Argument: This is necessary for consistency now that Article 35 has been added to the Code. The analogous case of a type subgenus is dealt with under (5) of the Article. This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: R. Ross.

Proposal no. 115

Art. 75

Proposal: Add to first sentence 'although an epithet originally published as part of an illegitimate name may be made legitimate later in another combination (see Art. 81).'

Argument: This insertion in Article 73 of a cross-reference to Art. 81 is desirable because some authors have overlooked the third sentence of Article 81 and have unjustifiably rejected names in which an epithet previously used in an illegitimate combination has been legitimately adopted. Thus Hitchcock (Man. Grasses W. Indies, 133; 1936) used the name *Chloris inflata* Link (1821) in place of *C. barbata* Swartz (Fl. Ind. Occ. 1: 200; 1797). The latter is based on *Andropogon barbatus* Linn. (1771), nomen illegit., non L. (1759), but Swartz in forming the name *Chloris barbata* was at liberty to employ the epithet *barbata,* there being no obstacle to its use under *Chloris,* and no other published epithet available. Henrard (Blumea, 2: 161; 1938) renames *Cleistochloa subjuncea* C. E. Hubbard, *C. hubbardiana,* although Hubbard (Hook. Ic. Pl. 33: tab. 3209, p.2; 1933) definitely stated that *C. subjuncea* is a *new name* (not a *new combination*) for *Panicum subjunceum* Domin (1915), nomen illegit., non Ekman (1911).

This is one of the proposals which it is suggested should be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: C. E. Hubbard.

Proposal no. 116

Art. 80

Proposal: Add at the end of the Article — 'except where they repeat the specific epithet and Article 35 requires their use'.

Argument: The existence of such specific names as *Aloe vera* L., *Aspidistra typica* Baillon, *Canarium legitimum* Miq., *Cola vera* K. Schum. and *Lavandula vera* DC. and *Melastoma normale* D. Don makes this proposal necessary. As the Code now stands, the type of *Aloe vera* L. must be called *A. vera* L. var. *vera* to distinguish it from *A. vera* var. *officinalis* (Forsk.) Baker, var. *chinensis* Haw. and var. *lanzae* (Tod.) A. Berger, in accordance with Article 35, whereas under Article 80 the name *Aloe vera* var. *vera* is illegitimate. The above proposal removes this contradiction.

Proposed by: A. W. Exell.

Proposal no. 117

Rec. 83 A

Proposal: Add: — (4) Generic names ending in *-oides* or *-odes* should be treated as feminine irrespective of the gender assigned to them by the original author'.

Argument: It has long been recognised (cf. Sprague in Kew Bull. 1935 : 556) that an ideal rule governing the gender of generic names which are modern compounds of classical words should be 1) easy to apply and 2) give the same gender to all generic names ending in the same element; this gender should coincide with that of classical words ending in the same element or with that already generally adopted by botanists for generic names ending in that element. The above provision meets these requirements.

The majority of botanical generic names ending in *-oides* and *-odes* have been treated as feminine, a few as neuter and some as either feminine or neuter. To treat them all as feminine automatically removes doubt and saves time. Generic names ending in *-oides* or *-odes* are adjectives given the status of nouns, the qualified word such as *planta* (f.), *herba* (f.), *filix* (f.), *arbor* (f.) or *βοτάνη* (f) being understood. They are constructed by analogy with such Greek adjectives as *βοτρυοειδής* (like a bunch of grapes), of which *βοτρυώδης* is an alternative form; *ἐχιδνοειδής* (snake-like), of which *ἐχιδνώδης* is an alternative form; *λυκοειδής* (wolf-like); *οἰνοειδης* (wine-like) etc. In these the *-o-* (*-o-*) represents the termination of the stem and the *-ides* the Greek *-ειδής* (masc. and f.) or *-ειδές* (neuter), from *εἶδος* 'shape'; the *-odes* ending is a contracted form in which *οει* is replaced by *ω*. Since on transliteration into Latin no distinction is made between *-ης* and *-ες,* the gender cannot be evident

from the form of the word itself and, in the absence of a provision treating all such words as of the same gender, "the gender assigned by the author or if he has failed to indicate it, by the first subsequent author who has done so, must be retained." In practice it is not always easy to ascertain this. Pre-Linnaean authors coined about a hundred such names and thus incurred the ridicule and censure of Linnaeus *(Critica Bot.* no. 226), to whom they were so utterly abhorrent that he rejected them all, himself coining new names when the genera seemed distinct. In doing this he sometimes failed to distinguish genera, e.g. *Nymphoides* and *Menyanthes,* now recognised as distinct. The first revival of such genera after 1753 was usually made in works of pre-Linnaean character not employing the binomial system of nomenclature, so that it is often not clear whether the author would have treated these *-oides* or *-odes* names as feminine or neuter. Much time-wasting bibliographical enquiry, which may be inconclusive and also difficult owing to the rarity of the books concerned, can accordingly be avoided, and uniformity and simplicity of usage can be promoted, by treating all *-oides* and *-odes* generic names as feminine.

It is appreciated that the ancients might have given such names the gender of the first element, *sesamoides* being the neuter like *sesamum.* To adopt such procedure nowadays, treating for example *Hyacinthoides* as masculine like *Hyacinthus, Nymphoides* as feminine like *Nymphaea, Alyssoides* as neuter like *Alyssum,* would introduce unnecessary complications without any compensating advantages and would be contrary to the prevailing view that generic names ending in the same element should have the same gender.

Proposed by: W. T. Stearn.

Proposal no. 118

App. II

Proposal: It is recommended that the sign of hybridity forming part of the name of a hybrid should be a *small* multiplication sign, but a *large* multiplication sign should be used to connect the names of the parents in a formula, e.g. *Salix x capreola* (= *Salix aurita X S. caprea*); *x Asplenosorus* (= *Asplenium X Camptosorus*).

Argument: This is the typographical procedure adopted in the *International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants.* It provides a simple and useful distinction between the sign as used in a name and the sign used in a formula. This proposal is one for the attention of the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: W. T. Stearn.

Proposal no. 119

App. III

Proposal: Replace the present (1952) appendix by the *International Code of Nomenclature for Cultivated Plants* (1953).

Argument: See above under Article 38. This Code is an extension of the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* and has been made by the joint action of the International Botanical Congress Committee for the Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants and the International Committee on Horticultural Nomenclature and Registration. It is designed for the naming of these cultivated plants (clones, lines or strains or groups of these maintained in cultivation) which are not covered by the *I.C.B.N.* and it in no way conflicts with this. It replaces the provisional version published with the *I.C.B.N.* in 1952.

This proposal is one for the attention of the Editorial Committee.

Proposed by: W. T. Stearn.

B. Anträge von Erwin Janchen (Wien)

Proposal no. 120

Die leitenden Grundsätze des Nomenklatur-Codex sind ganz ausgezeichnet; nur sind einige derselben bei Aufstellung mancher Regeln und Empfehlungen zu wenig berücksichtigt worden. Daher sei es gestattet, zunächst an folgende Sätze aus Artikel 3 und 4 nachdrücklich zu erinnern:

„The Code of nomenclature should be simple and founded on considerations sufficiently clear and forcible for everyone to comprehend and be disposed to accept. The essential points in nomenclature are: (1) to aim at fixity of names; (2) to avoid or to reject the use of forms and names which may cause error or ambiguity or throw science into confusion."

Außerdem sollte mehr als bisher auf folgendes Rücksicht genommen werden. Die

wissenschaftlichen Pflanzennamen werden nicht nur von botanischen Taxonomen verwendet, sondern von Botanikern sämtlicher Forschungszweige, ferner von Gärtnern, Landwirten, Forstwirten, Pharmazeuten, Medizinern usw. und von verschiedenartigsten Pflanzenfreunden. Allen diesen soll man keine unnötigen Schwierigkeiten bereiten.

Das Bestreben, diese Grundsätze bei den einzelnen Regeln praktisch durchzuführen, war bei den meisten der nachstehenden Anträge maßgebend. Man vergleiche auch meinen Artikel „Vorschläge zur Benennung der Blütenpflanzen Deutschlands", Repert. spec. nov., 50: 351-361 (1941), im folgenden mit „Rep. 50" zitiert.

Art. 13

Als wichtiges Beispiel einer einzuschiebenden Kategorie sei genannt: Phylum (Stamm), zwischen Regnum vegetabile und Divisio. Sehr viele neuere Pflanzensysteme können ohne diesen Begriff nicht auskommen.

Art. 24

Ich beantrage, daß hier die grundsätzliche Möglichkeit ausgesprochen werde, auch für Arten (Species) eine Liste von nomina conservanda aufzustellen. Zur Begründung verweise ich auf meine Artikel „Anregung zur Schaffung einer Ausnahmsliste für die Namen der Pflanzen-Arten", Repert. spec. nov. 53: 61-71 (1944) und „Die Zweckmäßigkeit einer Ausnahmsliste für die Namen der Pflanzen-Arten", Botan. Notiser, 1950: 336-340. Eine größere Anzahl von Namen, die noch bis vor kurzem allgemein gebräuchlich waren, lassen sich am besten und einfachsten durch eine Arten-Ausnahmsliste retten. Eine zu weitgehende Anwendung der Arten-Ausnahmsliste kann vom General-Komitee jederzeit verhindert werden.

Art. 32

Ich beantrage die Aufhebung und Streichung dieses Artikels. Er bringt keinerlei Vorteile. Seine praktische Durchführung stößt auf mannigfache Schwierigkeiten. Er verstößt gegen den Grundsatz der Stabilität (Artikel 4, Punkt 1), da eine große Anzahl bisher gebräuchlicher Namen ganz unnötiger Weise geändert werden müßten. Er verstößt gegen den Grundsatz der Priorität (Artikel 16), da in sehr zahlreichen Fällen jüngere Namen an die Stelle älterer Namen treten müßten. Er verstößt ferner gegen den bisher allgemein durchgeführten Grundsatz, daß jeder Name eines Taxons einen Autornamen besitzen muß (Art. 55). Ausnahmen von Grundsätzen sind nur dann gerechtfertigt, wenn ein wichtigerer Grundsatz sie erfordert oder wünschenswert erscheinen läßt. Bei Artikel 32 ist dies aber nicht der Fall.

Rec. 33 B

Die Verwendung des Genitivs und der adjektivischen Form desselben Personennamens zur Bezeichnung zweier verschiedener Arten derselben Gattung, wie z.B. *Lysimachia Hemsleyana* und *L. Hemsleyi* ist so verwirrend, daß sie nicht nur für die Zukunft vermieden, sondern auch für die Vergangenheit durch eine Regel verboten werden sollte. Siehe meinen Anträge zu Artikel 73 und 82 und zu Empfehlung 82 I.

Art. 35

Ich beantrage die Aufhebung und Streichung dieses Artikels mit derselben Begründung wie bei Artikel 32 (siehe oben). Allenfalls kann man in einer Empfehlung für die Zukunft von der Bildung neuer Namen abraten.

Art. 43

Dritter Absatz. Es ist eine sehr begrüßenswerte neue Bestimmung, daß ein Fragezeichen die Giltigkeit einer Veröffentlichung nicht behindert. Als gutes Beispiel hiefür sollte *Pinus nigra* Arnold (1785) angeführt werden. Dieser Fall wurde von *Neumayer* und mir in Österr. Botan. Zeitschr. 91: 215 (1942) eingehend besprochen. Der Name wurde von seinem Autor in einer übertriebenen Bescheidenheit und Vorsicht mit einem „?" veröffentlicht, obwohl aus dem Text klar hervorgeht, daß er selbst davon überzeugt war, es mit einer neuen Art zu tun zu haben.

Rec. 54 D

Ich beantrage die Streichung dieser Empfehlung oder eine völlige Veränderung derselben in folgendem Sinn: Die Verwendung eines nomen nudum, also nicht giltig veröffentlichen Namens, für eine andere, neue oder neu zu benennende Art ist unbedingt zu vermeiden. Wenn aber für eine neue oder neu zu benennende Art bereits ein nomen nudum vorhanden ist, so steht der Verwendung desselben für *diese* Art nichts im Wege. Dadurch kann oftmals dem Autor des nomen nudum sein geistiges Urheberrecht gewahrt werden. Ein ganz ähnlicher Fall ist die Veröffentlichung eines Herbarnamens durch einen späteren Autor.

Rec. 54 I

Der französische Text gibt den Sinn des englischen Textes nicht genau wieder. Denn

„the last-published sheet of the volume" muß nicht gerade „la dernière feuille de volume" sein, sondern kann auch (und wird wohl häufiger) die Hinterseite des Titelblattes oder eine andere Seite des Titelbogen sein.

Art. 58

Den letzten Satz des groß gedruckten Textes halte ich für verfehlt und ich beantrage eine Abänderung desselben in folgendem Sinn: Wenn es wünschenswert oder nötig ist, eine solche Zitation abzukürzen, so ist derjenige Autor, welcher den Namen geschaffen hat, beizubehalten; nur anstatt der Bezeichnung „Hort." ist derjenige Autor zu setzen, welcher den Namen veröffentlicht hat. Begründung: Der geistige Urheber des Namens bzw. des Taxons ist der erste Autor, welcher den Namen geschaffen hat. Seine Urheberschaft (Autorschaft) wird auch von dem zweiten Autor anerkannt. Es wäre also eine Verletzung seines Urheberrechtes, wenn man in einem verkürzten Zitat gerade ihn wegließe. Dagegen ist „Hort." keine bestimmte Persönlichkeit, sondern ein Anonymus, besitzt folglich auch kein Urheberrecht; daher kann „Hort." schadlos weggelassen werden. Beispiel zum ersteren Fall: *Lavandula officinalis* Chaix ex Vill. oder kurz: *L. officinalis* Chaix (nicht *L. officinalis* Vill.!). Vgl. das Beispiel zu Artikel 75!

Rec. 58 A

Hiemit beantrage ich eine Ergänzung in folgendem Sinn: Wenn es wünschenswert oder nötig ist eine solche Zitation abzukürzen, so hat man sich auf die Anführung des ersten Autors zu beschränken.. Beispiel: *Primula villosa* Wulf. in Jacq. oder kurz *P. villosa* Wulf.

Art. 60

Hiemit beantrage ich die Ergänzung durch einen zweiten Satz mit folgendem Sinn: Wenn es wünschenswert oder nötig ist stark abzukürzen, so kann der eingeklammerte Zusatz wegbleiben.

Art. 63

Hiemit beantrage ich die Ergänzung durch einen Satz mit folgendem Sinn: Der ursprüngliche Name oder das ursprüngliche Epitheton ist bei einer Aufteilung des Taxons dann nicht beizubehalten, sondern zu verwerfen, wenn der Name oder das Epitheton wiederholt in verscheidenem Sinn (für verschiedene Arten oder bald für eine Kleinart bald für die Gesamtart) verwendet worden ist, so daß seine Anwendung für einen Teil dauernd zu Verwechslungen und Irrtümern Anlaß geben würde (Art. 4, Punkt 2). Beispiele: *Eriophorum polystachyum Gentiana acaulis, Euphrasia officinalis, Stipa pennata, Festuca ovina.* Mit Ausnahme des erstgenannten Falles sind die Namen wenigstens nur bei weitem Artbegriff als Namen von Gesamtarten verwendbar. *Stipa pennata:* Linné's Typus ist wahrsch. *St. eriocaulis,* nicht *St. Joannis. Festuca ovina:* ein Typus ist kaum feststellbar, schwerlich *F. vulgaris. Euphrasia officinalis:* vgl. Rep. 50: 356/357.

Art. 64(3)

Muß entfallen, wenn Artikel 32 nicht aufrecht erhalten wird. Siehe dort.

Art. 65(1 b)

Hiemit beantrage ich eine Ergänzung in folgendem Sinn: Bei Übertragung einer Art in eine andere Gattung kann das spezifische Epitheton nicht beibehalten werden, wenn der sich ergebende binäre Name widersinnig ist oder wenn er zu Verwechslungen und Irrtümern Anlaß geben würde. — Widersinnige Namenskombinationen entstehen dann, wenn ein auf *-oides, -inus, -aceus, -formis, -florus, -folius* u. dgl. endigendes Art-Epitheton in jene Gattung übertragen wird, deren Ähnlichkeit durch die Endung ausgedrückt werden sollte (vgl. Rep. 50: 359-361). Beispiele: *Phleum phleoides, Alyssum Alyssoides, Cerastium Cerastoides, Luzula luzulina, Lolium loliaceum, Sedum sediforme, Agrostis agrostiflora.* In diesen Fällen wird also der Name der Gattung mit einer der vorgenannten Endungen wiederholt. Doppelnamen wie *Linaria Linaria* wurden abgeschafft. Ein Doppelname ist als Tautologie ein wenig sinnvoller Pleonasmus, aber schließlich auch nicht ärger als etwa Bonbon oder Agar-Agar. Ein Name wie *Phleum phleoides* ist dagegen viel schlimmer; er ist ein völliger Unsinn, genau so wie ein hundeähnlicher Hund oder ein menschenähnlicher Mensch. Mit derartigen Namen müssen sich die Botaniker vor jedem Nicht-Biologen, der einiges Gefühl für logisches Denken und vernunftgemäße Sprache besitzt, geradezu lächerlich machen. Wie verträgt sich dies aber mit dem Grundsatz von Artikel 3, daß die Nomenklaturregeln auf so klaren und überzeugenden Gesichtspunkten beruhen sollen, daß jedermann sie begreift und geneigt ist sie anzunehmen? Man frage doch einmal in den Kreisen unvoreingenommener Nicht-Taxonomen, also etwa Physiologen oder Vertretern der angewandten Botanik, wer die Notwendigkeit derart sinnwidriger

Namen begreift und geneigt ist, solche Namen anzunehmen. Wer aber den Standpunkt vertritt, daß die ewigen Denkgesetze noch über den Mehrheitsbeschlüssen eines Kongresses stehen und daß ein Kongreß gar nicht befugt ist, die Logik auszuschalten, der wird bei solchen Entgleisungen nicht mittun.

Widersinnige Namen, wenn auch nicht ebenso bösartiger Natur entstehen auch dann, wenn ein Epitheton, das in Verbindung mit dem ursprünglich zugehörigen Gattungsnamen einen guten Sinn hatte, in eine Gattung übertragen wird, wo es diesen Sinn verliert. Beispiele: *Fragaria sterilis*, eine Erdbeerpflanze ohne genießbare Frucht, wird zu *Potentilla sterilis;* hier ist das Epitheton sinnlos; der logisch richtige Name wäre *Potentilla Fragariastrum. Tormentilla erecta,* aufrecht im Vergleich zu *Tormentilla procumbens,* wird zu *Potentilla erecta;* hier ist das Epitheton bedeutungslos und eher irreführend; überdies besteht die ständige Gefahr einer Verwechslung mit *Potentilla recta;* in jeder Hinsicht besser wäre der Name *Potentilla Tormentilla.*

Art. 73(5)

Muß entfallen, wenn Artikel 32 nicht aufrecht erhalten wird. Siehe dort.

Art. 73(8)

Hiemit beantrage ich die Erweiterung des Artikels 73 durch Aufnahme einer Bestimmung mit folgendem Sinn: Ein Name eines Taxons ist zu verwerfen, wenn er wegen seiner Anwendung in verschiedenem Sinn *oder aus anderen Gründen* eine dauernde Quelle von Verwechslungen und Irrtümern bildet. Hierher gehören zunächst schon mehrere bei Besprechung der Artikel 63 und 65 genannte Beispiele. Dazu kommen u.a. noch folgende (vgl. Rep. 50: 355/356). Der Name *Picea Abies* (L.) Karsten für die als *Picea excelsa* (Lam.) Link allgemein bekannte gewöhnliche Fichte. Dieser Name, der übrigens auf einen verwirrenden Irrtum *Linné's* zurückzuführen ist, wäre besonders in der Forstbotanik und im Unterricht wegen ständiger Verwechslung von Fichte und Tanne geradezu verheerend und ganz unmöglich. Er ist folglich unbedingt abzulehnen. Irreführend wirken auch Artnamen, welche nach ihrer Form einen Bastard vortäuschen. Es sind dies *Juncus alpino-articulatus* Chaix apud Villars (1786) für die als *Juncus alpinus* Vill. (1787) bekannte Pflanze und *Luzula alpino-pilosa* (Chaix) Breistroffer für *Luzula spadicea* (All.) Lam. et DC. Diese sehr unzweckmäßig gebildeten *Chaix'*schen Namen wurden in früheren Zeiten mit Recht völlig unbeachtet gelassen. Man sollte sie auch jetzt baldigst wieder verschwinden lassen. Zu dauernden Verwechslungen müssen auch die bereits bei der Empfehlung 33 B erwähnten Namen wie *Lysimachia Hemsleyana* und *L. Hemsleyi* Anlaß geben. Eine unzweideutige Ausschaltung solcher Namen wäre etwa folgendermaßen auszudrücken: Die genitivische und die adjektivische Form eines Personennamens dürfen nicht in derselben Gattung zur Benennung verschiedener Sippen verwendet werden, oder: Artnamen, die von demselben Personennamen als Genitiv und als Adjektiv abgeleitet sind, können nicht in einer Gattung neben einander bestehen. Da der besprochene Fall auch mit den orthographischen Varianten einige Berührungspunkte hat, so soll er bei Artikel 82 und bei Empfehlung 82 I nochmals erwähnt werden.

Art. 77

Dieser Artikel erscheint mir mit dem Ausdruck „Monstrosität" etwas zu eng gefaßt. Ich beantrage daher seine Erweiterung in dem Sinne, daß Namen oder Epitheta zu verwerfen sind, wenn sie auf eine Bildungsabweichung (Abnormität) begründet sind (vgl. Rep. 50: 357/358). Durch diesen Artikel sollen alle jene Namen von einer Verwendung als Art-Epitheta oder Gattungsnamen ausgeschlossen werden, bei deren Aufstellung der Autor ein so abweichend entwickeltes Individuum (oder deren mehrere) vor sich hatte, daß er die richtige Art- oder Gattungszugehörigkeit nicht erkannt hat. Gewöhnlich wurden diese abweichenden Eigentümlichkeiten in der Beschreibung besonders hervorgehoben, mitunter sogar im Namen ausgedrückt und oft auch zu jener Art in Gegensatz gestellt, zu welcher sich die Pflanze späterhin als zugehörig erwies. Derartige Namen auf die ganze Spezies auszudehnen, hat meistens recht mißliche Folgen und wirkt oft direkt irreführend. Daher ist es besser, solche Namen überhaupt grundsätzlich nicht anzuwenden außer zur Bezeichnung jener Bildungsabweichung (Abnormität), für welche sie ursprünglich geschaffen worden sind.

Ein bezeichnendes Beispiel ist *Petroselinum crispum* (Mill.) Nyman, welcher Name von manchen neueren Autoren für *P. hortense* Hoffm., die gewöhnliche Petersilie, eingesetzt wird. Das Epitheton *crispum* bezeichnete aber schon bei *Miller* (in der Gattung

Apium) ausdrücklich nur die Kraus-Petersilie, d.i. die krausblättrige, nahezu monströse Form der gewöhnlichen Petersilie. In der gärtnerisch-landwirtschaftlichen Botanik wird man bei dem Epitheton *crispum* immer nur an die Kraus-Petersilie denken. Die Ausdehnung dieses Epithetons auch auf die Normalform ist ein schwerer Mißgriff, der andauernd zu Mißverständnissen und Irrtümern Anlaß geben muß.

Ein weniger schwerwiegender Fall ist *Sempervivum Braunii* Funck (1835), welcher Name für eine gelblichweiß blühende Bildungsabweichung des normaler Weise purpurrot blühenden *S. stiriacum* Wettstein (1909) aufgestellt worden ist. Doch halte ich auch in diesem Fall die Ausdehnung des Namens der Bildungsabweichung auf die Gesamtart für unzweckmäßig.

Art. 79(3)

Hiemit beantrage ich eine erweiterte Fassung dieser Bestimmung in folgendem Sinne: Spezifische Epitheta müssen verworfen werden, wenn sie den Gattungsnamen unverändert oder auch *mit einer orthographischen Variante* wiederholen. Beispiel: *Silaum Silaus* (vgl. Rep. 50: 358/359). Der Gattungsname wurde bald *Silaus*, bald *Silaum* geschrieben; daher handelt es sich hier um einen ausgesprochenen Doppelnamen.

Art. 79(3b)

Hiemit beantrage ich die Einfügung einer neuen Bestimmung, welche im Sinne des weiter oben beantragten und begründeten Artikels 65, Punkt 1b folgendes besagt: Spezifische Epitheta müssen verworfen werden, wenn sie den Gattungsnamen mit Endungen wie *-oides, -inus, -aceus, -formis, -florus, -folius* u.dgl. wiederholen, wodurch widersinnige Namenskombinationen entstehen (vgl. Art. 65, 1b).

Art. 79(4)

Hier wäre es nötig, wenigstens durch die Beispiele eine klare Stellungnahme zu den Werken von *Gilibert* einzunehmen. Während *Hylander* mit Berufung auf die Bestimmungen dieses Artikels die *Gilibert*'schen Namen gänzlich ablehnt, halten andere Autoren diese Ablehnung für unbegründet.

Art. 82

Orthographische Fehler. In der früheren Fassung der Nomenklaturregeln (Brittonia 6: 1947, Art. 70) machte man einen Unterschied zwischen absichtlichen und unabsichtlichen (unintentional) orthographischen Fehlern. Nur die letzteren durften verbessert werden. Man vertrat also den Standpunkt: ein absichtlich gemachter Fehler darf nicht verbessert werden. Es ist schwer verständlich, daß ernste Männer der Wissenschaft einen derart fortschrittsfeindlichen Standpunkt eingenommen haben. Die Ehrfurcht vor den alten Botanikern braucht doch nicht so weit zu gehen, daß man auch ihre orthographischen Fehler unangetastet übernimmt. Im Codex von 1950/1952 ist die Unterscheidung zwischen absichtlichen und unabsichtlichen orthographischen Fehlern erfreulicherweise weggelassen; es können jetzt alle orthographischen Fehler verbessert werden. Darin erblicke ich einen Sieg der Vernunft und des natürlichen Rechtsgefühles über Unvernunft und engherzigen Formalismus. In den auf die vernünftige Regel folgenden Beispielen sind aber noch einige Reste der früheren Engherzigkeit stehen geblieben. So sind *Mesembryanthemum* und *Amaranthus* doch gewiß ausgesprochene orthographische Fehler. Nach dem Sinn der jetzt geltenden Regel ist also ihre Verbesserung in *Mesembrianthemum* und *Amarantus* zulässig. (Bezüglich *Amarantus* besteht zwischen dem englischen und dem französischen Text eine bemerkenswerte Verschiedenheit.) Die verbesserte Schreibweise dieser Namen war lange Zeit sehr gebräuchlich und ist auch in *Dalla Torre* und *Harms*, Genera Siphonogamarum, angenommen. Dieses Werk nimmt überhaupt bezüglich orthographischer Verbesserung einen sehr vernünftigen Standpunkt ein, der allgemeine Billigung finden könnte und sollte.

Als orthographischer Fehler, der verbessert werden muß, ist auch die Schreibweise *sylvatica* statt *silvatica*, z.B. in *Fagus sylvatica* L. aufzufassen. Die Schreibweise *silvatica* ist nicht nur richtiger, sondern auch gebräuchlicher. Es ist eine geradezu ungeheuerliche Zumutung, daß man sich in jedem einzelnen Falle merken soll, welche Pflanzen *sylvatica* und welche *silvatica* heißen oder bei welchen man *sylvestris* und bei welchen man *silvestris* zu schreiben hat. Wozu soll eine solche kleinliche Unterscheidung dienlich sein? Man frage wieder nicht nur die Taxonomen allein, sondern auch Vertreter aller anderen Zweige der Botanik, denn auch diese haben öfters mit *Fagus silvatica* zu tun, wer im Sinne des Artikels 3 solche rückschrittliche Vorschriften begreift und geneigt ist sie anzunehmen. Ich sehe darin eine unverständliche Entgleisung, die baldigst ausgemerzt werden muß.

Unter den Beispielen für verschiedene spezifische Epitheta stehen auch *Lysimachia Hemsleyana* und *L. Hemsleyi*. Derartige Namen sind aber wegen der ständigen Verwechslungsgefahr wie orthographische Varianten zu behandeln und dürfen nicht neben einander bestehen bleiben (vgl. Artikel 73, Empfehlung 33 B und Empfehlung 82 I).

Unter den Beispielen für orthographische *Varianten* spezifischer *Epitheta* stehen *macrostachys* und *macrostachyus*. Im Widerspruch dazu sind aber die Gattungsnamen *Desmostachys* und *Desmostachya* unter den Beispielen für *verschiedene* Namen angeführt.

Rec. 82 A

Diese sehr richtige Empfehlung sollte zu einer Regel erhoben werden und dadurch rückwirkende Kraft erhalten. Wo in der Vergangenheit der griechische spiritus asper nicht mit *h* transskribiert wurde, sollte man dies als einen orthographischen Fehler betrachten, der verbessert werden muß. Demgemäß zu verbessern wären z.B. die Gattungsnamen *Elodea* in *Helodea, Edraianthus* in *Hedraianthus* usw.

Rec. 82 B(c) & 82 C(c)

Die Anweisung „diacritic signs should be suppressed" läßt sich nicht in allen Fällen schadlos durchführen, besonders nicht bei slavischen Worten, die dadurch eine völlig veränderte Aussprache erhalten würden. Hier kann man nur entweder die diakritischen Zeichen beibehalten oder die betreffenden Buchstaben in angemessener Weise transskribieren. Beide Vorgänge sollten in einer Neufassung der Empfehlung als zulässig genannt werden.

Rec. 82 F

Die Schreibweise *silvestris* statt *sylvestris* sollte nicht nur für die Zukunft empfohlen, sondern auch für die Vergangenheit verpflichtend gemacht werden (vgl. Artikel 82).

Rec. 82 G

Hiemit beantrage ich die Aufhebung der Empfehlung 82 G und die Rückkehr zu der früheren Empfehlung XLIII in folgendem Sinn: Es wird empfohlen, solche Epitheta mit *großem* Anfangsbuchstaben zu schreiben, die entweder von (reellen oder mythischen) Personennamen in substantivischer oder adjektivischer Form abgeleitet sind oder welche Gattungsnamen, alte (ehemalige) Gattungsnamen oder (substantivische) Vernakularnamen darstellen. Begründung: Es ist sehr zweckmäßig und daher wünschenswert, daß man derartige Epitheta schon sofort an ihrem großen Anfangsbuchstaben von gewöhnlichen adjektivischen Epithetis unterscheiden kann. Die seit dem Jahre 1950 empfohlene Kleinschreibung steht überdies in Widerspruch zu logischen und grammatikalischen Überlegungen. Wenn man beispielsweise in dem Namen *Amygdalus communis* den Gattungsnamen, wie allgemein üblich, mit großem Anfangsbuchstaben schreibt, dann muß folgerichtig auch in *Prunus Amygdalus* das Art-Epitheton *Amygdalus* mit großem Anfangsbuchstaben geschrieben werden, denn es ist dasselbe Wort, ist in beiden Fällen ein Hauptwort und ist in beiden Fällen ein Eigenname. Unter solchen Umständen besteht keine zureichende Begründung zu einer verschiedenen Schreibweise.

Solange man also die Gattungsnamen als Eigennamen betrachtet und demgemäß mit großem Anfangsbuchstaben schreibt, was bisher glücklicherweise noch unangetastet geblieben ist, muß man folgerichtiger Weise auch die Epitheta, die den Charakter von Eigennamen tragen, ebenso behandeln.

Rec. 82 I

Der letzte Satz ist zu ändern in dem Sinne, daß die genitivische und die adjektivische Form von Personennamen nicht in derselben Gattung zur Benennung verschiedener Sippen verwendet werden dürfen bzw. bestehen bleiben können. Vgl. Artikel 73 und 82 sowie Empfehlung 33 B.

Rec. 83 A (2, pars 4)

Nach dem Satz, welcher die Endungen *-nema, -stigma, -stoma* behandelt, ist ein Satz folgenden Sinnes einzufügen: Dagegen sind die auf *-osma* endigenden Namen Feminina, da sie vom griechischen feminischen Wort osmé (Geruch) abgeleitet sind, z.B. *Camphorosma, Onosma, Barosma, Agathosma;* die Behandlung solcher Namen als Neutra ist falsch und daher abzulehnen (vgl. Rep. 50: 354, Anm. 3).

Rec. 83 C

Wäre besser zu streichen. Die Einführung von (auch neu gebildeten) Pflanzennamen, die den modernen Sprachen entlehnt sind, fördert die Pflanzenkenntnis und Pflanzenliebe in breiteren Kreisen, ist daher von lebensnahen Wissenschaftlern nur zu begrüßen und sollte in keiner Weise unnötig behindert werden.

C. Propositions soumises par J. Rousseau (Montréal)

Proposition n. 121

Art. 1

L'article devrait se lire: "Botany cannot make satisfactory progress without a precise *and simple* system of nomenclature which is used by *the botanists* in all countries".

Commentaires. 1o. Avec la rédaction actuelle: "which is used by *the great majority of botanists..*", cette loi fondamentale prend l'allure d'une recommandation. La loi ne peut être facultative et s'appliquer uniquement à la majorité. 2o. En ajoutant dans l'article 1 les mots "and simple", l'article 3 devient superflu. Il y aurait avantage à alléger le plus possible le code.

Art. 3

A supprimer, si l'amendement précédent est accepté.

Art. 17

Devrait se lire: "No one can change a name (or combination of names) without serious motives based either *on some adequate taxonomic study* or on the necessity of giving up a nomenclature that is contrary to the rules of this code". Supprimer la recommandation 17A.

Commentaires. La rédaction actuelle "without serious motives based either *on more profound knowledge of facts*" a une implication beaucoup plus étendue que celle qu'on veut lui donner. Le *Conioselinum chinense* a été ainsi nommé parce que l'auteur a confondu le nom de la localité type, *Genesee*, aux Etats-Unis, avec le nom de la *Chine*. S'il suffit pour changer un nom d'une "connaissance approfondie des faits", un auteur peut se croire autorisé à remplacer l'épithète *chinense* par une autre plus appropriée. Un article ultérieur s'y objecte, mais il vaut mieux éviter dès le début l'ambiguité.

Art. 24

Nomina conservanda. 1o. L'adoption des *nomina conservanda*, en désaccord avec le principe de priorité, s'avérait néanmoins nécessaire pour éviter des bouleversements inutiles dans la nomenclature. Toutefois pour peu que l'on continue indéfiniment cette pratique, le code de nomenclature se ramènera un jour à un simple catalogue de noms. Depuis un demi siècle, les botanistes ont eu le temps de proposer la plupart des *nomina conservanda* qui s'imposaient. Les découvertes bibliographiques susceptibles de bouleverser la nomenclature deviennent de plus en plus rares. Il semble opportun de clore la liste. Je soumets donc pour discussion l'amendement suivant: "Remplacer la note 1 telle que rédigée actuellement, par la suivante: "La liste des nomina conservanda est définitivement close depuis le Congrès international de botanique en 1954".

2o. Il faudrait indiquer clairement que l'on peut ou non reprendre un *nomen rejiciendum* lorsqu'un genre, portant un *nomen conservandum* est divisé en plusieurs genres. Pour fins de discussion, je propose d'ajouter au présent article la note suivante: "In the event of the division of a genus in two or more genera, the nomen rejiciendum can be restored as a legitimate name for one of the new genera, provided the author who restores the name is considered as the creator of the generic name".

Rec. 30 A(c)

Ce paragraphe se lit: "Not to take names from *barbarous languages*, unless those names are frequently cited in books of travel, and have an *agreeable* form that is readily adaptable to the Latin tongue and the tongue of civilized countries". Le paragraphe devrait se lire simplement: *"To avoid names not readily adaptable to the Latin tongue"*.

Commentaires: Avant le code de Stockholm, l'article débutait par ces mots: "Botanists who are forming generic names show *judgment and taste...*" Cette phraséologie est disparue; et cependant la lecture du paragraphe (c) ne montre pas que nous faisons preuve de "jugement et de bon goût" ou même de culture. Il n'appartient pas aux systématistes de décider des normes de la civilisation. Puisque notre nomenclature est latine, il ne serait pas mal de se rappeler que pour les anciens Romains les "Barbares" comprenaient notamment les peuplades du nord de l'Europe, depuis la France jusqu'à la Scandinavie. L'acception moderne du mot ne règle pas davantage le problème. Les peuplades sauvages, ont parfois des noms de plantes harmonieux pouvant se latiniser facilement, et des botanistes les ont fréquemment adoptés comme noms génériques. On sait aussi que beaucoup de noms français, anglais, hollandais, scandinaves etc. (donc de

langues de peuples civilisés) ne peuvent se latiniser harmonieusement. La nouvelle rédaction s'appliquerait beaucoup mieux à nos fins et aurait peut-être l'avantage de ne pas provoquer des sourires.

Rec. 54 E

Supprimer cette recommandation, qui pour toutes fins pratiques n'est qu'une répétition des articles 44 et 45. Alors que les articles 44 et 45 sont impératifs, la recommandation 54E semble apporter un palliatif inutile.

Art. 77

Se lit "A name or epithet of a taxon must be rejected when it is based on a monstruosity". L'article devrait se lire plutôt "A name or epithet of a taxon must be rejected when it is based on non hereditary teratological characters".

Commentaires: La forme actuelle pourrait nous obliger à définir ce que nous entendons par monstruosité. Des mutations peuvent être envisagées comme des monstruosités. Toutefois, comme leurs caractères sont héréditaires, elles devraient pouvoir prendre rang dans les cadres taxonomiques, et c'est ce qui a lieu effectivement.

Rec. 83 C

Devrait être supprimée. Cet article se lit: "Every friend of science should oppose the introduction into a modern language of names of plants which are not already there. . .".

Commentaires. Il n'appartient pas au Code de nomenclature botanique de décider ce que doivent être les noms vernaculaires. Il ne doit s'occuper que de la nomenclature botanique internationale, nécessairement en langue latine. Pourrait-on empêcher les humanistes et littérateurs de formuler le principe suivant: "Every friend of culture should oppose to the use of vernacular names deriving from latin botanical names, unless they are formed according to the genius of the language used".

New Art. 84

Modifications du code. Un article spécifique devrait prévoir la procédure à suivre lors des amendements au code. C'était l'objet de l'art. 74 tel que cité dans le Synopsis of proposals du congrès de Stockholm. Cet article devra fournir des précisions sur le choix des délégués accrédités à la section de nomenclature.

D. Propositions soumises par R. de Litardière (Grenoble)

Proposition n. 122

Art. 16

Supprimer: *"Une exception est faite en faveur de 9 familles pour lesquelles des noms dits alternatifs sont autorisés".*

La fixité des noms étant un point essentiel en fait de nomenclature, comme il est spécifié à juste raison dans l'Art. 4, nous nous demandons pourquoi autoriser des noms qui pourraient être *différents* suivant les auteurs pour désigner *une même* famille.

Art. 28

Supprimer: *"Toutefois à la place de ces noms les botanistes ont la faculté d'en utiliser d'autres fondés sur ceux des genres-types et terminés en -aceae".*

Voir ce qui est dit plus haut à propos de l'Art. 16.

Art. 35

A supprimer.

Cet article ne peut être qu'une source d'équivoques ou d'erreurs, ce qui va évidemment à l'encontre des buts essentiels que doit se proposer une nomenclature scientifique, tels qu'ils sont définis dans l'Art. 4. D'ailleurs son application exigerait souvent des difficultés insurmontables, par ex. s'il est nécessaire d'avoir des renseignements précis sur les échantillons-types, renseignements susceptibles de suppléer au laconisme des descriptions (si fréquent chez les anciens auteurs). Il faudrait également que ces échantillons fussent complets, possédant notamment l'organe qui est utilisé pour la création d'une variété nouvelle. Il est des cas où il serait nécessaire d'examiner soi-même les types (ce qui peut être matériellement impossible), car les auteurs que l'on pourrait consulter à ce propos sont susceptibles parfois d'avoir une opinion différente sur une plante donnée *.

* Citons un exemple se rapportant au *Juniperus Oxycedrus* L. On sait que cette espèce comprend 2 sous-espèces mentionnées dans les flores (par ex. Ascherson et Graebner, *Syn.* 1: 248; Briquet, *Prodr. Fl. corse* 1: 46; Maire, *Fl. Afr. N.* 1: 112-113) sous les noms

Citons deux exemples qui montrent combien est inopportun l'Art. 35.

Saurons-nous exactement ce que représente le "*Festuca rubra* L. subsp. *rubra* var. *rubra* subvar. *rubra*" que nous verrions figurer dans un texte? Par contre, *Festuca rubra* L. subsp. *eu-rubra* Hack. *Mon. Fest.* 138 var. *genuina* (Godr.) Hack. l.c. 139 subvar. *vulgaris* (Gaud.) Hack. l.c. 139 représentera pour nous quelque chose de concret, car nous pouvons nous reporter aux caractères assignés par Hackel dans sa *Monographia Festucarum europaearum.*

Second exemple. On peut se demander s'il y a un avantage quelconque à changer le nom du subsp. *vulgaris* S. M. Walters de l'*Eleocharis palustris* (L.) R. Br. em. Roem. et Schult., dont les caractères ont été très bien définis par son auteur dans l'étude qu'il a consacrée à diverses espèces du genre [in *Journ. Ecol.* 37: 192-206 (1940)], en celui de subsp. *palustris,* adopté, conformément aux Règles de 1952, par Clapham, Tutin et Warburg [*Fl. Brit. Isles* 1342 (1952)]. L'emploi, sans nom d'auteur, du vocable subsp. *palustris* (en admettant que ce vocable s'applique parfaitement au *Scirpus palustris* L.) ne permet en rien de nous rendre compte si la plante ainsi désignée possède les caractères qui sont indiqués par Clapham, Tutin et Warburg, à moins de citer Clapham, Tutin et Warburg comme auteurs de la combinaison, mais, dans ce cas, nous agissons à la fois à l'encontre des prescriptions du Code et à l'encontre de la règle de priorité!

De ces deux exemples, il s'en suit que l'emploi des vocables *Festuca rubra* L. "subsp. *rubra* var. *rubra* subvar. *rubra*", d'une part, et *Eleocharis palustris* (L.) R. Br. em. Roem. et Schult. "subsp. *palustris*", d'autre part, nécessite, pour *être explicites,* l'adjonction, entre parenthèses, de la "synonymie", à savoir, pour l'exemple du *Festuca rubra:*

subsp. *eu-rubra* Hack. var. *genuina* (Godr.) Hack. subvar. *vulgaris* (Gaud.) Hack. et pour celui de l'*Eleocharis palustris:*

subsp. *vulgaris* S. M. Walters.

Cette méthode que nous avons employée dans la fascicule 8 de nos *Nouvelles Contributions à l'étude de la Flore de la Corse* (in *Candollea* 14: 128-157) évite toute ambiguité, mais n'est évidemment pas faite pour simplifier les textes! Nous estimons donc indispensable de revenir aux anciennes Règles, bien faciles à appliquer.

Entièrement d'accord avec MM. Sauvage et Vindt (in *Bull. Soc. Sc. nat. Maroc* 31: 238), nous pensons qu'il faut "adjoindre, comme par le passé, au nom désignant la forme typique d'une espèce le nom des auteurs qui l'ont crée et définie".

Recommandation 58 A

Au lieu de: *in,* mettre: *apud.*

A notre avis, le mot *in* doit être réservé pour indiquer, dans une citation bibliographique ajoutée à un nom de taxon, que la description se trouve dans un périodique,

par ex.: *Teucrium charidemi* Sandwith apud Lacaita, in *Cavanillesia* 3: 38 (1930).

Art. 75

Au lieu de: *Lavandula officinalis* Chaix, mettre: *Lavandula angustifolia* Mill. [qui est le plus ancien nom valide (1768), le *L. officinalis* Chaix datant de 1785].

Art. 79

Nous proposons qu'il soit indiqué dans cet article que les noms spécifiques créés par Gilibert et publiés dans le *Flora lituanica inchoata* (1781) et dans l'*Exercitia phytologica* (1792) soient *tous* déclarés illégitimes, car cet auteur n'a pas suivi "d'une manière rigoureuse" la nomenclature binaire (cf. Hylander *Nomenklatorische und systematische Studien über nordische Gefässpflanzen* 16).

---

de subsp. *rufescens* (Link) Deb. *Fl. Kab. Djundj.* 411 (1894) et subsp. *macrocarpa* (Sibth. et Sm.) Ball, *Spic. Fl. marocc.* 670 (1878). Le *J. Oxycedrus* L. (*Sp. Pl.* 1038), d'après Ascherson et Graebner (l.c.), englobe les 2 sous-espèces, mais le type conservé dans l'herbier de Linné, correspond au subsp. *macrocarpa.* Briquet (l.c.) donne le *J. Oxycedrus* L. "sensu stricto" (sic) comme synonyme du subsp. *rufescens* Deb. (dans ce cas, en appliquant l'Art. 35, nous devrions écrire: "subsp. *Oxycedrus*"). Maire (l.c. 113), par contre, indique le *J. Oxycedrus* L. "sensu stricto" (sic) comme synonyme du subsp. *macrocarpa* Ball (dès lors nous devrions remplacer le nom de subsp. *macrocarpa* Ball par celui de "subsp. *Oxycedrus*")! En admettant que le type linnéen corresponde au "subsp. *macrocarpa*", nous considérons que le vocable "subsp. *Oxycedrus*" qui pourrait lui être appliqué serait un vocable *extrêmement ambigu,* alors que le nom de subsp. *macrocarpa* (Sibth. et Sm.) Ball ne prête à aucune confusion. Des cas identiques pourraient certainement être encore cités.

Art. 80

A supprimer.

A notre avis, proscrire comme illégitimes les épithètes infraspécifiques telles que *typicus, originarius, genuinus,* etc., est contraire à la logique. Nous estimons qu'elles doivent être employées comme elles l'étaient suivant les anciennes Règles.

Recommandation 82 G

Elle devrait être rédigée ainsi:

"Les épithètes spécifiques ou infraspécifiques s'écrivent avec des minuscules, sauf celles qui dérivent de noms de personnes réelles ou mythiques (substantives ou adjectives) ou qui sont empruntées à des noms de genres".

Le texte actuel de la Recommandation laisse les auteurs libres d'employer ou non une capitale dans certains cas. Nous critiquons cette manière de faire, tout d'abord parce qu'elle est contraire à une unité dans la Nomenclature; d'autre part, parce que écrire avec des minuscules les épithètes dérivant de noms de personnes ou empruntées à des noms de genres peut présenter l'inconvénient de rendre certaines épithètes *incompréhensibles* ou encore *simuler des solécismes* (par ex. cas du *Convolvulus Cantabrica* L., si le nom spécifique était écrit avec une minuscule).

App. V a

P. 86, No 60: Une erreur doit avoir été commise dans la graphie *Cymodocia* Ch. Koen., car à la table (p. 147) il est écrit *Cymodocea.* Nous n'avons pas été á même de vérifier la graphie originale de Koenig. P. 104, No 2908. *Kernera.* Après: Med. 1792, ajouter: non Schrank (1786).

App. VI

En ce qui concerne les citations ajoutées aux noms de taxa, nous demandons à ce qu'elles soient faites suivant l'usage courant, par ex: *Tittmannia* Brongn. in *Ann. Sci. Nat.* 8 : 385 (1826)

Hedysarum gremiale Rollins, in *Rhodora* 43 : 230(1940)

Ferula tolucensis H. B. K. *Nov. Gen. Sp.* 5 : 12(1821).

Dans le cas de citations de périodiques, le mot *in* précèdant le titre du périodique évite toute confusion possible avec le titre d'un ouvrage.

Si les rédacteurs du Code ont supprimé délibérément toute majuscule aux noms spécifiques et infraspécifiques, ils se sont largement rattrapés en ce qui concerne les indications bibliographiques! En effet, dans ce dernier cas, tous les mots portent une capitale, même les adjectifs. Procéder de la sorte, c'est parfois dénaturer la citation. Ainsi en lisant (p. 185, Art. 63, ligne 15): "Briquet (Prodr. Fl. Corse 1: 264 (1910)", il est loisible de croire que l'auteur a publié un Prodrome de la flore de Corse (ou de la Corse), alors qu'il s'agit en réalité du *"Prodrome de la flore corse".* Nous admettrons à la rigueur que l'on puisse écrire flore avec un F majuscule, mais l'adjectif corse ne peut porter une majuscule!

E. Proposals by A. R. Pinto da Silva (Sacavem)

Proposal no. 123

Art. 16

Add to paragraph 2: "except in those cases of limitation of priority by conservation dealt with in Art. 24 and 25."

Argument. If this exception is not made here then Art. 24 will have no effect, as it would permit the use of names contrary to a rule (the Art. 16).

Another alternative would be to introduce in Art. 2 a reference to this exception by conservation. It seems preferable, however, not to refer to exceptions in Chapter I, as it deals only with guiding Principles and Definitions.

Although the limitation of the principle of priority appears only in Section 3 of Chapter III, Art. 16 (Section 1) already contains in its paragraph 1 a reference to "special exceptions" regarding 9 families for which alternative names are permitted, Art. 28 being cited to this effect. The present proposal aims at establishing a similar and adequate situation for the exceptions ruled by Art. 24 and 25.

Incidentally, I wish to call attention to the French translation of Art. 16, which seems neither clear nor to convey the exact meaning of the English text.

Art. 24 (Note 4)

Read as follows: "A conserved name is conserved against all its earlier validly published homonyms."

Argument. Using T. A. Sprague's words in *Taxon* 2: 132-133, it can be said: "It is true that, in the Code, unless otherwise indicated, the word "name" (and therefore also "homonym") means a name which has been validly published (see Art. 10, Note), but as this provision might easily be overlooked by those consulting Art. 24, Note 4 it seems better to make the wording of that note perfectly explicit."

It would be more in accordance with the wording of the last paragraph of Art. 74. The new wording is meant to facilitate the work of those who study nomina conservanda, bringing to hand a provision lost in a short note and easily overlooked.

Although the words "validly published" may be thought superfluous, (considering the note of Art. 10) they have been used in several other articles of the Code, as for instance in Art. 74.

Art. 31

Add to the second paragraph: "or are the names of the genera themselves (cf. Art. 32)."

Argument. The contradiction between the statements contained in Art. 31 and Art. 32 is evident: "such epithets are usually substantives *resembling* the names of genera", "The subgenus... must bear *that* (generic) *name unaltered*".

Art. 32

Insert: "or section" after "The subgenus".

Argument. Confront Rec. 32A and 32B. It must be avoided, for example, that the name *Soja* be given to Section I (by Taubert in Engler-Prantl, cf. Dalla-Torre & Harms) of *Glycine* of which the type-species is *Glycine javanica* and not *Soja hispida (S. max).*

Art. 48 (2)

Add: "even if such a description is a pre-Linnean one".

Argument. It seems convenient to emphasize this point in view of the last example given under Art. 48.

Art. 80

Modify as follows: "Specific and infraspecific epithets such as *typicus, originalis, originarius, genuinus, verus,* and *veridicus* are illegitimate." or, as an alternative, include in Art. 79 a new "case" worded as above and then rewording (or deleting?) Art. 80.

Argument. The Code does not forbid the use of adjectives such as *typicus,* etc. as specific epithets. For example: Lavandula vera DC. On the other hand, according to Art. 80, the adjective *verus* cannot be used as infraspecific epithet for the subdivision containing the nomenclatural type of the species (for instance, subsp. *vera*) and then the principle established by Art. 35 cannot be applied. It seems to me that the solution of this case, saving Art. 35!, appears to be the adoption of one of the modifications proposed above (when properly worded).

Art. 82

Delete the words: ", and the plants so closely related,".

Argument. The mere analysis of the example — *Bradlea* and other names commemorating Bradley — shows the condition expressed by the words to have been missed, as it truly deserves to be. In fact, *Bradlea* Adans. is a genus of *Leguminosae; Braddleya* Vell. and *Bradleya* O. Ktze. are genera of *Violaceae; Bradlaeia* Neck. is a genus of *Umbelliferae; Bradleja* Banks ex Gaertn. and *Bradleia* Cav. are genera of *Euphorbiaceae.* Even when *not* applied to "plants so closely related", such names must be considered as mere "orthographic variants", because they represent a "serious risk of confusion" which Art. 82 intends to avoid.

Rec. 82 B

Modify the last part of (a) as follows: "... except (1) when the name ends in *a,* when *ea* is added (e.g. *Collaea* after Colla) and (2) when the name ends in *ea, ia, oa* or *ua,* when the name must be adopted without an additional vowel (e.g. *Correa* after Correa, *Garcia* after Garcia, *Pessoa* after Pessoa, *Rua* after Rua)." (Note: all examples but the first are hypothetical.)

Argument. It must be noted, indeed, how strange it is to write, for example, *Correaea,* and how difficult, if not impossible, it is to pronounce such a name. The difficulty still increases if it becomes necessary to use the name under the genitive form: "in foliis *Correaeae* albae...", or if the name of a tribe is to be formed from it: *Correaeeae!*

Rec. 82 E

Add the termination *-inus.*

Examples: alpinus (from Alpes, Alpium), *valentinus* (from Valencia).

Rec. 82 F

Add: "the mediaeval spelling adopted by Linnaeus prevailing over the correct classical one." "Examples: *sylvaticus* (instead of *silva-*

ticus), sylvestris (instead of *silvestris*)." The example with the adjectives *sinensis* and *chinensis,* must, in my opinion, be deleted. It seems better to consider them as different adjectives as *monspeliensis, monspeliacus* and *monspessulanus.* In Art. 82, under Examples of retention of the original spelling, the following words should be omited: "The correct classical spelling is recommended for adoption in the case of a new name (Rec. 82F), but".

Argument. The subject of this proposal should, in my opinion, be reconsidered and analysed. I believe to be contrary to the spirit of the Code (Art. 3) the acceptance as legitimate the simultaneous use of different spellings for a given adjective or common noun, the classical and the mediaeval one as used by Linnaeus. The difficulty of finding names in alphabetical lists must be emphasized if both spellings are accepted by the Code as at present. Such an inconsistency of spelling of names so frequently used as *sylvaticus* or *sylvestris* does not seem in favour of the general acceptance of the Code. Whether or not one follows Linnaeus, one must always follow the same criterion!

App. V B

I suggest that, in future editions of the Code, *only* those names approved for conservation by a Congress, be included in the list of *Nomina generica conservanda* i.e. that *nomina generica conservanda proposita* appear only, and if thought advisable, in a separate list, independent of the Code itself.

Argument. The inclusion of these "proposita" names in Appendix V Section B, as is done in the 1952 edition of the Code, before their conservation was studied and accepted by the Committees, seems unjustifiable. It is liable to raise confusion and seems to be against the very aims of the Code (art. 4), as such names do not fulfil the conditions for use (Art. 25). Furthermore, Art. 24 announces *only* that "this Code provides lists of *names which must be retained as exceptions*".

F. MODIFICACIONES AL CODIGO INTERNACIONAL DE NOMENCLATURA BOTÁNICA

Proposals nos. 124-138 submitted to the Paris Congress*

por

Antonio Ponce de León y Aymé y Maria Teresa Alvarez (La Habana)

Proposición no. 124

FORMACION DEL CAPITULO V DEL CODIGO INTERNACIONAL DE NOMENCLATURA TAXONOMICA BOTANICA.

Por cuanto:

Los preceptos contenidos en las Secciones 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 y 13 del Capítulo III del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica guardan entre sí una relación más intima que con los de otras secciones del citado capítulo.

Por cuanto:

El contenido de dichas Secciones tiene importancia, extensión y uniformidad suficientes para dar lugar al establecimiento de un capítulo separado.

Formulamos la siguiente

PROPOSICION

Que se forme el Capítulo V del Código

Proposal no. 124

FORMULATION OF CHAPTER V OF THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF BOTANICAL TAXONOMIC NOMENCLATURE.

Whereas:

The precepts contained in Sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of Chapter III of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature are more closely related with each other than with those given in other sections of that chapter.

Whereas:

The contents of these Sections are of sufficient importance, extension and uniformity to justify the establishment of a separate chapter.

We formulate the following

PROPOSAL

That Chapter V of the International Code

*) The Spanish text of this proposal is the primary one.

Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica con el contenido de las Secciones 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 y 13 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica, el cual quedará constituido de la manera siguiente:

CAPITULO V.

DE LA RETENCION, SELECCION Y REPUDIACION DE LOS NOMBRES.

Sección 1. — *Retención de nombres o epitetos que han sido remodelados o divididos.*

Sección 2. — *Retención de epitetos de taxa bajo el rango de género que se transfieren a otro género o especie.*

Sección 3. — *Selección de nombres cuando se unen taxa del mismo rango.*

Sección 4. — *Selección de nombres de hongos con un ciclo vital pleomórfico.*

Sección 5. — *Selección de nombres cuando el rango del taxon se cambia.*

Sección 6. — *Repudiación de nombres y epitetos.*

Observaciones:

Los artículos de la Sección 1, marcados anteriormente con los Nos. 61, 62 y 63 tendrán los Nos. 65, 66 y 67.

Los artículos de la Sección 2, que tenian los Nos. 64, 65 y 66 tendrán ahora los Nos. 68, 69 y 70.

Los artículos de la Sección 3, Nos. 67 y 68, serán los Nos. 71 y 72.

El artículo 69 de la Sección 4 será ahora el No. 73.

Los artículos 70 y 71 de la Sección 5 serán los Nos. 74, 75 y 76.

Los artículos comprendidos desde el 72 al 81 que forman la Sección 6, tendrán ahora los Nos. del 77 al 86.

Debe tenerse en cuenta el cambio de los números de las referencias de acuerdo con la nueva numeración de los artículos.

Proposición no. 125

MODIFICACION DE LOS ARTICULOS QUE INTEGRAN LA SECCION 12 "ELECCION DE NOMBRES CUANDO EL RANGO DE UN TAXON ES CAMBIADO" DEL CAPITULO III DEL CODIGO.

Por cuanto:

Los preceptos contenidos en los artículos No. 70 y No. 71 que integran la Sección 12 del Capítulo III del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica, tienen una notable trascendencia.

Por cuanto:

No obstante haber sido ampliamente dis-

of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature be formed out of the contents of Sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, and that it will be redacted as follows:

CHAPTER V.

RETENTION, CHOICE AND REJECTION OF NAMES.

Section 1. — *Retention of names or epithets of taxa that are remodelled or divided.*

Section 2. — *Retention of epithets of taxa below the rank of genus on transference to another genus or species.*

Section 3. — *Choice of names when taxa of the same rank are united.*

Section 4. — *Choice of names of fungi with a pleomorphic life cycle.*

Section 5. — *Choice of names when the rank of a taxon is changed.*

Section 6. — *Rejection of names and epithets.*

Suggestions:

In Section 1 the former articles 61, 62 and 63 will be included as Art. 65, 66 and 67.

In Section 2 the former articles 64, 65 and 66 will be included as Art. 68, 69, and 70.

In Section 3 the former articles 67 and 68 will be included as Art. 71 and 72.

In Section 4 the former article 69 will be included as Art. 73.

In Section 5 the former articles 70 and 71 will be included as Art. 74, 75 and 76.

In Section 6 the former articles 72 to 81 will be included as Art. 77 to 86.

When in the following text these articles are quoted we will have to remember that their numbers have been altered.

Proposal no. 125

MODIFICATION OF THE ARTICLES FORMING SECTION 12 OF CHAPTER III OF THE CODE "CHOICE OF NAMES WHEN THE RANK OF A TAXON IS CHANGED".

Whereas:

The precepts contained in the articles 70 and 71, which form Section 12 of Chapter III of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, are of very great importance.

Whereas:

These articles, although they have been

cutidos en Congresos anteriores dichos artículos carecen aún de la suficiente claridad.

Por cuanto:

La Recomendación marcada con 71A, que debe ser aclarada, está más en relacion con el Artículo No. 70 que con el Artículo No. 71 donde aparece adjunta.

Formulamos las siguientes

PROPOSICIONES

A. — Que el Artículo No. 70 del Código sea dividido en dos, que serán los Artículos No. 74 y No. 75 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica, redactados en la forma siguiente:

Art. 74. Cuando un género se pasa a categoría inferior o cuando un taxon de rango infragenérico es cambiado de categoría, el nombre correcto o epiteto será el legitimado primeramente en el nuevo rango. En ninguno de estos casos un nombre o epiteto tiene prioridad fuera de su rango.

Observación:

Todos los ejemplos del primitivo Artículo No. 70 pasarán integramente a este nuevo Artículo No. 74.

Rec. 74A. 1. — Cuando un sub-género o una sección pase a género, o el cambio inverso ocurra, el nombre o epiteto original debe preferirse en la nueva denominacion, sin perjuicio de la prioridad que otro tenga ni se oponga a ello alguna disposicion del Código.

2. — Cuando una subdivision de una especie pase a especie, o el cambio inverso ocurra, el epiteto original debe preferirse, a menos que otro tenga prioridad o resulte una combinacion repudiada por el Código.

Art. 75. Cuando una especie u otro taxon de rango infragenérico se lleve a la categoría de género y sea adoptado el epiteto primitivo como nombre genérico, este epiteto perderá la prioridad en la categoría donde se encontraba.

Ejemplo: Si tomando como tipo *Laurus persea* L., se ha constituido el género *Persea,* la prioridad de *persea* como epiteto específico resulta eliminada.

B. — Que el Artículo No. 71 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica, que será el No. 76 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonomica Botánica, quede redactado como sigue:

widely discussed by former Congresses, are not sufficiently clear.

Whereas:

Recommendation 71A, which must be better formulated, is more closely related to Article 70 than to the Article 71 to which it has been added.

We present the following

PROPOSALS

A. — That Article 70 of the Code be divided in two, which will become Articles 74 and 75 of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature, and will be formulated as follows:

Art. 74. When a genus is lowered in rank or when the rank of an infrageneric taxon is changed, the correct name or epithet is the earliest legitimate one available in the new rank. In no case does a name or an epithet have priority outside its own rank.

Suggestion:

All examples mentioned under the former Article 70 will be reproduced under this new Article 74.

Rec. 74A. 1. — When a sub-genus or a section becomes a genus, or when the inverse change occurs, the original name or epithet should be preferred in the new denomination, unless another name has priority or unless it clashes with a rule of the Code.

2. — When a subdivision of a species becomes a species, or when the inverse change occurs, the original epithet should be retained, unless another one has priority or the resulting combination is rejected under the Code.

Art. 75. When a species or a taxon of infrageneric rank is raised to the rank of genus and when the original epithet is adopted as generic name, this epithet will lose the priority it had in its former rank.

Example: If *Laurus persea* L. is accepted as the type of a new genus *Persea,* the specific epithet *persea* has no longer priority.

B. — That Art. 71 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, which will become Art. 76 of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature, be formulated as follows:

Art. 76. Cuando un taxon de categoria comprendida entre género y orden inclusives, cambie de rango dentro de estos límites, de acuerdo con el Método de los Tipos Nomenclaturales, la raíz del nombre debe ser retenida y solamente alterada la terminacion (-inae), (-eae), (-oideae), (aceae), (-ineae), (-ales), sin que esto signifique que el nombre resultante no pueda ser repudiado por alguna causa prevista en este Código.

Proposición no. 126

MODIFICACION DEL ARTICULO 76 DEL CODIGO.

PROPOSICION

Que el párrafo segundo del Artículo 76 del Código, al pasar este artículo con el No. 80 al Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonomica Botánica, sea sustituido por la siguiente Nota:

Nota:

Aunque en un liquen se encuentran dos elementos distintos, como consecuencia de un hecho biológico y no como un hecho circunstancial, no procede la aplicación del artículo anterior. La nomenclatura de los líquenes se tratará en el Capítulo VII.

Proposición no. 127

INTEGRACION DEL CAPITULO VI DEL CODIGO INTERNACIONAL DE NOMENCLATURA TAXONOMICA BOTANICA.

Por cuanto:

Las Secciones 14 y 15 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica están suficientemente relacionadas entre si para poder formar un capítulo.

Formulamos la siguiente

PROPOSICION

Que con las Secciones 14 y 15 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica se integre el Capítulo VI del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonomica Botánica en la forma siguiente:

CAPITULO VI.

DE LA ORTOGRAFIA Y GENERO DE LOS NOMBRES.

Sección 1. — *Ortografía de los nombres y epitetos.*

Sección 2. — *Género de los nombres genéricos.*

Art. 76. When a taxon of a rank higher than a genus and not higher than an order, is changed in rank within these limits, the stem of the name must, in accordance with the Nomenclatural Type Method, be retained and only the termination altered (-inàe), (-eae), (-oideae), (-aceae), (-ineae) (-ales); this does not mean that the resulting name cannot be rejected if it is against the rules of this Code.

Proposal no. 126

MODIFICATION OF ARTICLE 76 OF THE CODE.

PROPOSAL

That the second paragraph of Art. 76 of the Code, which will become Art. 80 in the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature, be substituted by the following Note:

Note:

Although the compound nature of the lichens is a biological fact and not merely incidental, the above-mentioned article can not be applied to them. The nomenclature of lichens will be discussed in Chapter VII.

Proposal no. 127

CONTENTS OF CHAPTER VI OF THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF BOTANICAL TAXONOMIC NOMENCLATURE.

Whereas:

The relations between Sections 14 and 15 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature are sufficiently close to permit their segregation into a separate chapter.

We formulate the following

PROPOSAL

That the contents of Sections 14 and 15 of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature be combined in Chapter VI of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature and that the latter be redacted as follows:

CHAPTER VI.

ORTHOGRAPHY AND GENDER OF NAMES.

Section 1. — *Orthography of names and epithets.*

Section 2. — *Gender of generic names.*

Proposición no. 128

MODIFICACION DE LA RECOMENDACION 82E.

PROPOSICION

Que la Rec. 82E, que tendrá el No. 87E en el Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica, quede redactada en la forma siguiente:

Rec. 87E. Los epitetos tomados de nombres geográficos serán preferentemente adjetivos con las siguientes terminaciones:

1. — (-a), (-us), (-um) cuando se trate de una nación independiente.

Ejemplos: Cedrela mexicana (de México)
Linodrendon cubanum (de Cuba).

2. — (-ensis) cuando se trate de un país dependiente de otro, o de una provincia o localidad.

Ejemplos: Solanum havanense
(de la Habana, Cuba)
Rubus quebecensis
(de Quebec, Canadá).

3. — (-icus), (-ica), (-icum), (-aea) cuando se trate de una region geográfica.

Ejemplos: Coffea arabica,
Sporobolus indicus,
Pinus caribaea.

Proposición no. 129

CREACION DE UN NUEVO ARTICULO PARA LA SECCION 15.

Por cuanto:

La Sección 15 (Género de los nombres genéricos) aparece formada sólo por una Recomendación, marcada con una letra unida al número de un artículo que corresponde a otra Sección.

Por cuanto:

Dicha Recomendación, de extensión y complejidad inusitadas, está constituida en realidad por una serie de regulaciones.

Formulamos la siguiente

PROPOSICION

Que la Sección 15 del Capítulo III del antiguo Código, que ahora será la Sección 2 del Capítulo VI del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica, se inicie con el Artículo siguiente:

Art. 88. El género de los nombres genéricos tiene un caracter gramatical, pudiendo ser determinado mediante las siguientes regulaciones:

Proposal no. 128

MODIFICATION OF RECOMMENDATION 82E.

PROPOSAL

That Rec. 82E, which will become Rec. 87E in the International Code of Taxonomic Botanical Nomenclature be formulated as follows:

Rec. 87E. Epithets taken from geographical names are preferably adjectives with the following endings:

1. — (-a), (-us), (-um) when they refer to an independent nation.

Examples: Cedrela mexicana
(from Mexico)
Linodendron cubanum
(from Cuba).

2. — (-ensis) when they refer to a country that is subordinate to another one or to a province or locality of less importance.

Examples: Solanum havanense
(from Havana, Cuba)
Rubus quebecensis
(from Quebec, Canada).

3. — (-icus), (-ica), (-icum), (-aea) when they refer to a geographical region.

Examples: Coffea arabica,
Sporobolus indicus,
Pinus caribaea.

Proposal no. 129

ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW ARTICLE IN SECTION 15.

Whereas:

Section 15 (Gender of generic names) consists but of one Recommendation, indicated with a letter added to the number of an article belonging to another Section.

Whereas:

This Recommendation of unusual length and complexity consists in reality of a whole series of regulations.

We present the following

PROPOSAL

That Section 15 of Chapter III of the former Code, which will become Section 2 of Chapter VI in the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature begins with the following article:

Art. 88. The gender of generic names has a grammatical character, which is determinated by the following regulations:

(Estas regulaciones serán precisamente las que aparecen en la Rec. 83A que integra la antigua Sección 15).

Proposición no. 130

FORMACION DE UN CAPITULO PARA LA NOMENCLATURA BIOSISTEMATICA.

Por cuanto:

Las ciencias biológicas, como la Genética y la Ecología, ejercen notable influencia sobre la Taxonomía y en consecuencia sobre la Nomenclatura.

Por cuanto:

El parasitismo determina en los organismos caracteristicas tales que permiten establecer formas esciales (formae speciales).

Por cuanto:

Existen asociaciones vegetales (simbiosis) que influyen tambien en las caracteristicas de los que las integran, como en el caso de los Líquenes.

Por cuanto:

Existen formas de caracter puramente genético que pueden dar lugar a la consideracion de taxa.

Por cuanto:

Los preceptos relacionados con la Nomenclatura Biosistemática se encuentran diseminados por distintas partes del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica.

Formulamos la siguiente

PROPOSICION

Que con lo especificado en la Rec. 37B, en el párrafo segundo del Art. 76 y lo consignado en el Apéndice II del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica, teniendo además en cuenta lo establecido en su Art. 23 y los preceptos que al efecto se añaden, se integre el Capítulo VII del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica en la forma siguiente:

CAPITULO VII

DE LOS NOMBRES DADOS A DETERMINADOS TAXA DE CARACTER BIOSISTEMATICO.

Sección 1. — *Nomenclatura de los parásitos y de los simbióticos.*

Sección 2. — *Nomenclatura de los híbridos.*

Sección 3. — *Denominación de algunas categorias especiales.*

(These regulations are the same as those of Rec. 83A, which makes up the former Section 15).

Proposal no. 130

FORMATION OF A CHAPTER FOR BIOSYSTEMATIC NOMENCLATURE.

Whereas:

Biological sciences, as Genetics and Ecology, exercise a notable influence on Taxonomy and, in consequence, on Nomenclature.

Whereas:

Parasitism determines in the organisms characters that allow the establishment of special forms (formae speciales).

Whereas:

There are plant associations (symbioses) that effect the character of its component organisms, as in the case of the Lichens.

Whereas:

There are forms of a purely genetic character that may force us to regard them as separate taxa.

Whereas:

The precepts concerned with Biosystematic Nomenclature are now spread over different parts of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature.

We present the following

PROPOSAL

To relegate to Chapter VII of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature the contents of Rec. 37B, of the second paragraph of Art. 76 and of App. II of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature; the precepts of Art. 23 should furthermore be taken into consideration, and the Chapter should receive the following form:

CHAPTER VII

NAMES GIVEN TO DEFINITE TAXA OF A BIOSYSTEMATIC CHARACTER.

Section 1. — *Nomenclature of parasites and symbionts.*

Section 2. — *Nomenclature of hybrids.*

Section 3. — *Denomination of some special categories.*

Proposición no. 131

ORGANIZACION DE LA SECCION 1 DEL CAPITULO VII.

PROPOSICION

Que la Sección 1 del Capítulo VII del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonomica Botánica quede organizada en la forma siguiente:

Sección 1. — *Nomenclatura de los parasitos y de los simbióticos.*

Art. 89. En las formas debidas al parasitismo (formae speciales) se requiere la denominacion de ambas especies.

Rec. 89A. (Será la misma Recomendacion 37B del antiguo Código).

Art. 90. A los propósitos nomenclaturales, los nombres de los líquenes deben ser considerados como aplicados al hongo que interviene en la simbiosis, pero teniendo en cuenta lo previsto en el nuevo Art. 40, correspondiente con el Art. 23 (d) en el antiguo Código.

Rec. 90A. Agregar al nombre del hongo que determina al liquen el simbolo *sb,* expresión abreviada de la palabra simbiosis.

Proposición no. 132

ORGANIZACION DE LA SECCION 2 DEL CAPITULO VII.

PROPOSICION

Que la Sección 2 del Capítulo VII del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica quede integrada por el Apendice II sin la Rec. H. 5A.

Observación:

Los articulos H. 1, H. 2, H. 3, H. 4 y H. 5 de este Apéndice, serán los Artículos Nos 91, 92, 93, 94 y 95 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonomica Botánica.

Proposición no. 133

INTEGRACION DE LA SECCION 3 DEL CAPITULO VII.

PROPOSICION

Que la Sección 3 del Capítulo VII del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica quede constituida de la manera siguiente:

Sección 3. — *Denominacion de algunas categorias especiales.*

Art. 96. Cuando organismos reproducidos asexualmente pueden dar lugar a taxa se seguirán las siguientes Recomendaciones.

Proposal no. 131

CONSTITUTION OF SECTION 1 OF CHAPTER VII.

PROPOSAL

That Section 1 of Chapter VII of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature be constituted as follows:

Section 1. — *Nomenclature of parasites and symbionts.*

Art. 89. In forms due to parasitism (formae speciales) the denomination of both species is required.

Rec. 89A. (This is the same as Recommendation 37B of the former Code).

Art. 90. For nomenclatural purposes names given to lichens shall be considered as applying to the fungus that takes part in the symbiosis, but shall be subject to the provisions of the new Art. 40, which corresponds to Art. 23 (d) of the former Code.

Rec. 90A. The symbol *sb,* which is an abbreviation of the term symbiont, should be added to the name of the fungus from which the name of the lichen is derived.

Proposal no. 132

CONSTITUTION OF SECTION 2 OF CHAPTER VII.

PROPOSAL

That Section 2 of Chapter VII of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature be formed out of the contents of Appendix II but without Rec. H. 5A.

Suggestion:

The articles H. 1, H. 2, H. 3, H. 4 and H. 5 of this Appendix will become Articles 91, 92, 93, 94 and 95 of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature.

Proposal no. 133

CONTENTS OF SECTION 3 OF CHAPTER VII.

PROPOSAL

That Section 3 of Chapter VII of the International Code of Taxonomic Botanical Nomenclature be constituted as follows:

Section 3. — *Denomination of some special categories.*

Art. 96. When organisms with asexual reproduction are regarded as taxa, the following Recommendations must be observed.

Rec. 96A. Si se consideran de rango específico, se intercalará la abreviatura *"ap"* (apomicts) entre el nombre genérico y el epiteto.

Si se consideran de rango infraespecífico, se intercalará la abreviatura *"ap"* entre el vocablo de la categoría y el epiteto infraespecífico.

Rec. 96B. Los taxa correspondientes a clones deben designarse, si se desea, por el termino "clone" (*"cl."* abreviado) o con el simbolo Para la colocacion del vocable de la categoria se seguirá el procedimiento sugerido para los apomicts.

Proposición no. 134

CREACION DEL CAPITULO VIII (FINAL CHAPTER)

Por cuanto:

La Sección 16 del Capítulo III del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica resulta heterogénea y de naturaleza distinta de las anteriores.

Formulamos la siguiente

PROPOSICION

Que la Sección 16 del Capítulo III del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica sea convertida en el Capítulo VIII del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonomica Botánica como puede verse a continuación:

CAPITULO VIII.

NOMBRES VULGARES Y SISTEMA DE MEDIDAS.

Sección 1. — *Nombres vulgares.*

Art. 97. Les nombres populares carecen de la precision necesaria para que se tenga en cuenta en la delimitacion de los taxa.

Observación.

Las Recomendaciones 83 B y 83 C pasarán a ser las numeradas 97 A y 97 B respectivamente.

Sección 2. — *Sistema oficial de Medidas.*

Art. 98. El empleo del Sistema Métrico Decimal es obligatorio en la diagnosis de las unidades taxonómicas en Botánica.

Observaciones:

La Rec. 83 D pasará a ser la 98 A suprimiendose el primer reglón.

Las Recomendaciones 83 E, 83 F y 83 G pasarán a ser, respectivamente, las 98 B, 98 C y 98 D.

Rec. 96A. If they are considered of specific rank, the abbreviation *"ap"* (apomicts) should be interpolated between the generic name and the epithet.

If they are considered of infrageneric rank, the abbreviation *"ap"* should be interpolated between the infraspecific epithet and the rest of the name.

Rec. 96B. Taxa which are clones may, if desired, be designated as such by the term "clone" (abbreviated as *"cl."*) or by the symbol.. In the placing of this sign the procedure suggested for the apomicts should be followed.

Proposal no. 134

ESTABLISHMENT OF CHAPTER VIII (FINAL CHAPTER)

Whereas:

Section 16 of Chapter III of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature is heterogeneous and differs in its nature from preceding ones.

We present the following

PROPOSAL

That Section 16 of Chapter III of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature be changed into Chapter VIII of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature and that it be given the following form:

CHAPTER VIII.

POPULAR NAMES AND SYSTEM OF MEASURES.

Section 1. — *Popular Names.*

Art. 97. Popular names lack the precision that is necessary to be taken into consideration in the delimitation of taxa.

Suggestion.

Rec. 83 B and 83 C will become Rec. 97 A and 97 B.

Section 2. — *Official System of Measures.*

Art. 98. The use of the Metric System is obligatory in Botany in the diagnoses of taxonomic units.

Suggestions:

The first line of Rec. 83 D is to be deleted and the rest will become 98 A.

Rec. 83 E, 83 F and 83 G will become 98 B, 98 C and 98 D.

Proposición no. 135

MODIFICACIONES FINALES.

Por cuanto:

En los Apéndices III y IV del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica se amplian determinados preceptos del Código, por lo que pierden las caracteristicas de Apéndices para convertirse en Complementos.

Formulamos la siguiente

PROPOSICION

1. — Que el Apéndice IV se denomine en lo sucesivo *Complemento I.* (PB). Disposiciones especiales concernientes a Plantas Fósiles.

2. — Que el Apéndice III se denomine en lo sucesivo *Complemento II* (C.) Nomenclatura de las Plantas cultivadas.

Proposición no. 136

Por cuanto:

Las Secciones A y B del Apéndice V del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Botánica responden a finalidades muy distintas, pues mientras en una de ellas se consignas excepciones en la otra se aspira a la mas correcta aplicacion de los preceptos del Código.

Formulamos las siguientes

PROPOSICIONES.

1. — Que la Sección B del Apéndice V constituya el Apéndice I *"Nomina Generica Conservanda"* del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonomica Botánica.

2. — Que con la Sección A del Apéndice V se constituya el Apéndice II *"Nomina Familiarum Conservanda"* del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonomica Botánica.

Proposición no. 137

UNA NUEVA PROPOSICION SOBRE MODIFICACION DEL ART. No. 28 DEL CODIGO.

Por cuanto:

El Art. 28 del Código Internacional de Nomenclatura Taxonómica Botánica requiere mayor claridad y concisión de acuerdo con la nueva estructura del Código.

Formulamos la siguiente proposicion:

Que el mencionado Art. 28 quede redactado en la forma siguiente:

Art. 28. El nombre de una familia es un adjetivo en plural usado como sustantivo,

Proposal no. 135

FINAL MODIFICATIONS.

Whereas:

Appendix III and IV of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature lost their character as certain precepts of the Code have been widened by them, they should be transformed into supplements.

We present the following

PROPOSAL

1. — That Appendix IV be named, from now on, *Supplement I* (PB.) Special provisions concerning fossil plants.

2. — That Appendix III be named, from now on, *Supplement I* (C.) Nomenclature of Cultivated Plants.

Proposal no. 136

Whereas:

Sections A and B of Appendix V of the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature have different purposes, since one of them registers exceptions, and the other one aims at a correct application of the precepts given in the Code.

We present the following

PROPOSALS.

1. — That Section B of Appendix V becomes Appendix I *"Nomina Generica Conservanda"* of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature.

2. — That Section A of Appendix V becomes Appendix II *"Nomina Familiarum Conservanda"* of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature.

Proposal no. 137

A NEW PROPOSAL FOR THE MODIFICATION OF ART. 28 OF THE CODE.

Whereas:

Art. 28 of the International Code of Botanical Taxonomic Nomenclature needs, in accordance with the new structure of the Code, more clearness and conciseness.

We propose that Art. 28 be formulated as follows:

Art. 28. The name of a family is a plural adjective used as a substantive, and is de-

que se deriva del nombre del género considerado como tipo de la familia, para lo cual se adiciona al *tema* (radical de dicho nombre en genitivo) el sufijo *aceae.*

Nota 1. Si el nombre pertenece a las declinaciones latinas la., 2a., 4., o 5a. no aparecerá diferencia entre el radical del nombre del género y el que resulte para la familia. Ejemplos:

De Malv-a	Malv-ae Malv-aceae
De Ros-a	Ros-ae Ros-aceae
De Solan-um . . .	Solan-i Solan-aceae
De Chenopodi-um .	Chenopodi-i Chenopodi-aceae
De Mor-us	Mor-i Mor-aceae

Si el nombre genérico pertenece a la 3a. declinación latina (que presenta la desinencia del genitivo en *is*), es necesario tener cuidado con muchos que proceden del griego y conservan la forma primitiva del genitivo en este idioma, lo cual da lugar a que, en apariencia, ocurran variantes en la composicion de los nombres de familias. Ejemplos:

De Cyc-as	Cycad-is Cycad-aceae
De Jugl-ans	Jugland-is Jugland-aceae
De Ir-is	Irid-is Irid-aceae
De Hamamel-is . .	Hamamelid-is Hamamelid-aceae
De Saccharomyc-es .	Saccharomycet-is Saccharomycet-aceae
De Papav-er	Papaver-is Papaver-aceae
De Borag-o	Boragin-is Boragin-aceae
De Melastom-a . .	Melastomat-is Melastomat-aceae

Nota 2. Si el nombre del género que se tomó como tipo para la familia pasa a la sinonimia, igualmente debe pasar a la sinonimia el nombre de la familia de él derivado.

Nota 3. Los clásicos nombres excepcionales Palmae, Gramineae, Cruciferae, Leguminosae, Guttiferae, Umbelliferae, Labiatae y Compositae, deben ser considerados como sinónimos. Los botánicos deben usar preferentemente los nombres terminados en *aceae,*

rived from the name of the type genus by adding the suffix *aceae* to the *stem* (as shown in the genitive).

Note 1. When the name belongs to the 1st, 2nd, 4th, or 5th latin declination there will be no difference between the stem of the genus name and the stem of the family name. Examples:

From Malv-a . . .	Malv-ae Malv-aceae
From Ros-a	Ros-ae Ros-aceae
From Solan-um . .	Solan-i Solan-aceae
From Chenopodi-um .	Chenopodi-i Chenopodi-aceae
From Mor-us . . .	Mor-i Mor-aceae

When the generic name belongs to the 3rd latin declination (in which the genitive ends in *is*) we must bear in mind that many of these names are of Greek origin and retain the original form of genitive and that this may lead to variations in the composition of the family name. Examples:

From Cyc-as . . .	Cycad-is Cycad-aceae
From Jugl-ans . . .	Jugland-is Jugland-aceae
From Ir-is	Irid-is Irid-aceae
From Hamamel-is .	Hamamelid-is Hamamelid-aceae
From Saccharomyc-es	Saccharomycet-is Saccharomycet-aceae
From Papav-er . . .	Papaver-is Papaver-aceae
From Borag-o . . .	Boragin-is Boragin-aceae
From Melastom-a . .	Melastomat-is Melastomat-aceae

Note 2. If the name of the genus that is accepted as type of a family becomes a synonym, the name of the family derived from it also becomes a synonym.

Note 3. The time-honoured but irregular names Palmae, Gramineae, Cruciferae, Leguminosae, Guttiferae, Umbelliferae, Labiatae and Compositae, should be treated as synonyms. Botanists should prefer the name that in accordance with the rules ends in *aceae,*

de acuerdo con las reglas y, en estos casos, para más claridad, colocar entre paréntesis, al lado, el nombre excepcional a que es equivalente.

Explicación.

Dada la manifiesta imprecisión de este artículo en su forma primitiva, no obstante lo tratado en Utrecht y acordado en Estocolmo, en atención a uno de los principios básicos del Código, hemos trabajado por aclararlo.

Ahora bien, en la imposibilidad de dictar preceptos más concretos, no queda más remedio que ir a la estructuración filológica de los términos, procurando presentarla en la forma más sencilla.

Este Código, no es una serie de principios para que los interpreten sólo los eruditos, sino una sucesión ordenada de preceptos que puedan ser fácilmente comprendidos y aplicados, con las suficientes aclaraciones para que responda a una finalidad práctica: la formación de los nombres de los *Taxa*. Por eso entendemos que se hacen necesarias las notas que completan este importante artículo.

Respecto a los sinónimos, entendemos que si un nombre no es adecuado ya para un género mucho menos debe serlo para formar el de una familia.

Proposición no. 138

ADICION SOBRE NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA.

PROPOSICION

Que al consignarse el nombre del género tipo que sirve para derivar el nombre de una familia, además del nombre en nominativo, se ponga el genitivo, destacando el *tema* que sirve de radical para la formacion del nombre de la familia.

Ejemplos:

Juncaceae.	T.:	Juncus L.
	t.:	Junc-i
Lecythidaceae.	T.:	Lecythis Loefl.
	t.:	Lecythid-is
Plantaginaceae.	T.:	Plantago L.
	t.:	Plantagin-is

T. representa el género tipo.
t. representa el tema.

and add, for a greater clearness, the irregular equivalent in parentheses.

Explanation.

In view of the manifest lack of precision which the wording of this article retained in spite of the efforts made at Utrecht and Stockholm, we have tried to formulate this article, which we regard as one of the basic rules of the Code, with greater clearness.

As it proved impossible to formulate concise rules in another way, we had to pay attention to the philological structure of the words, but we tried to make the precepts as simple as possible.

This Code is not necessarily a series of rules to be understood and used exclusively by classical scholars. It intends to offer practical indications for the formation of the names of *Taxa*. For this reason we are of opinion that our explanatory notes are necessary to complete this important article.

With regard to synonyms we believe that if a name is inadequate for a genus, it is even more inadequate as a base for the name of a family.

Proposal no. 138

ADDITION TO NOMINA FAMILIARUM CONSERVANDA.

PROPOSAL

That the name of the type genus from which the name of a family is derived, should not be given in the nominative only, but also in the genitive, and that the stem should be indicated, as the family name is derived from the latter.

Examples:

Juncaceae.	T.:	Juncus L.
	t.:	Junc-i
Lecythidaceae.	T.:	Lecythis Loefl.
	t.:	Lecythid-is
Plantaginaceae.	T.:	Plantago L.
	t.:	Plantagin-is

T. represents the type genus.
t. represents the stem.

G. Proposals by Bernard Boivin (Ottawa)

Proposal no. 139

Art. 6

Change the second sentence to read as follows:

"If however an organism is transferred from the animal to the plant kingdom, its name or names shall be automatically accepted as validly published under the botanical code, provided they were validly published under the zoological code. However the choice of the correct name and of its correct form shall be made in accordance with the rules of botanical nomenclature. If an organism is transferred from the plant to the animal kingdom, its names retain their status in botanical nomenclature for purposes of homonymy."

Argument: This proposal would not in my opinion change the meaning of Art. 6, but would make it clearer. That it needs clarification is evidenced by the fact that some botanists (see J. W. G. Lund in Taxon 2: 18. 1953) consider that such taxa, when transfered to the plant kingdom, would need to be supplied with Latin diagnoses to retain their valid status.

Art. 10

Paragraph 3. Add: "See Art. 16".

Argument: Correct names are properly and fully defined under Art. 16.

Art. 10

Paragraph 4, change to read as follows: "*Effective* publication is publication in accordance with Art. 39 & 41."

Argument: It is necessary to mention Article 41 in connection with effective publication as this Article also deals with effective publication.

Art. 10

Paragraph 5. Change to read as follows: "Valid publication is publication in accordance with Art. 6, 42-54 & C. 24.

Argument: The mention of the additional articles seems necessary as the said articles also deal with valid publication.

Art. 16

Paragraph 3. Delete the words "below the rank of genus" and substitute: "of specific or lower rank."

Argument: The article should apply only to names of species and subdivisions thereof. It should exclude subgenera, sections, etc., as it does not seem desirable to apply strictly the rules of priority, etc., to those categories. Many names of genera and sections were originally published in an off-handed manner and a great many name changes would be necessary if the rules were applied strictly to those categories. Furthermore, subgenera, sections, etc., are not listed in standard indices, such as the Index Kewensis, and the application of priority for those groups would involve extensive bibliographic surveys. After all, in most cases, the usefulness of these groups does not transcend the pages of monograph and we might just as well leave it to the monographer to decide which names are best suited for each one of these groups. Strict rules would impose an unessential and time-consuming burden upon monographers.

Art. 32

Delete the word "subgenus" and substitute: "subdivision of a genus".

Argument: This rule should apply to sections and subsections as well so that the name of any taxon, except a species, which includes the type of the next higher taxon should be formed after the name of that higher taxon.

Art. 42

Add: "Note 3. For plant taxa originally published as animals, see Art. 6."

Argument: This addition under Section 6 seems to be desirable in order to bring to the attention of botanists a special type of valid publication.

App. VI (texte français)

Item (5). Second paragraphe. Au mot "virgule" substituer: "deux-points" (Le texte anglais se lit "colon" et non pas "comma").

H. Proposals by L. C. Wheeler (Los Angeles)

Proposal no. 140

Art. 19

Add: "misunderstanding of the nomenclature, or other definite error. A species assigned, either by direct statement, or by inclusion of subordinate categories, by the author of a taxon must be taken as type."

Argument: As now worded this article ignores the fact that choice of types above species is often, perhaps always, a matter of nomenclature, and that errors would then arise from errors of nomenclatural understanding, not "misinterpretation of the original description" which is a taxonomic matter.

Examples of unacceptable typifications based on correct taxonomic interpretation of the original description: (1) Croizat, Rev. S. Am. Bot. Montevideo 6: 10. 1939, typified the monotypic *Pleuradena* Rafinesque, Atlantic Jour. 1(6): 182. 1833, by *Euphorbia pulcherrima* in spite of the fact that Rafinesque not only included only one species, *Pleuradena coccinea,* in 1833, but later (Fl. Tellur. 4: 113. 1838) specifically designated this as type. The correct belief that *Poinsettia pulcherrima* Graham, 1836, is synonymous is irrelevant to typification of *Pleuradena.* See Wheeler, Contrib. Gray Herb. 127: 58-59. 1939, for additional discussion. (2) Croizat, Amer. Jour. Bot. 24: 703. 1937, typified *Tithymalus* Miller, Gard. Dict., ed. 4 (abridged), 3: *Tithymalus.* 1754, by *Tithymalus padifolius* (L.) Croizat. This typification is inadmissible under the important principle that a species assigned to a taxon by its author should, for purposes of typification, take precedence over species assigned by other authors. The discussion by Wheeler, Contrib. Gray Herb. 127: 46. 1939, will serve to elucidate the problem in general, as well as the particular problem of typifying genera published in polynomial works: "Type species: *Tithymalus myrtifolius* Miller, Gard. Dict. ed. 8, *Tithymalus* 1. 1768; chosen here. The abridged ed. 4 was polynomial. The first binomial edition was the eighth, published in 1768. Included in the genus in 1754 were two species designated by polynomials. The first was: '1. **Tithymalus** *frutescens, folio myrti amplissimo. Tourn.*' (Tournefort, Institutiones 1: 654 [564 by error]. 1700). In 1768 Miller had '1. **Tithymalus** *(My[r]tifolius)* folii ovatis acuminatis ... Tithymaloides frutescens folio myrti amplissimo. Tourn. Inst. 654.' Hence Miller himself considered his first species of 1754 identical with his first species of 1768. (The use of *Tithymalus* rather than *Tithymaloides* in the first quotation is explained by Miller, l.c., 1754: 'I have applied the old Name *[Tithymalus]* to this Genus, rather than that of *Tithymaloides.*' The second species was excluded in the choice of the type due to the fact that the phrase name used in 1754 differed from that cited in synonymy in 1768." Neither of these errors was due to a misinterpretation of the original description.

Art. 39

Paragraph 1, delete: "or by the issue of microfilm made from manuscripts."

Argument: This, as stated, permits publication by microfilm so long as it was not made from a manuscript. What is a manuscript? How can it be identified? With modern typewriters there are type faces indistinguishable for all practical purposes from the faces of conventional metal type. This, plus variable spacing permitting justification of the lines, means that the distinction between a microfilm constituting valid publication, and another worthless for publication would rest on the virtually impossible distinction between type faces of one origin or another as they appear on the microfilm. Is the present provision intended to permit or prohibit publication by microfilm made from conventional letter press copy if that existed as a single copy?

It is unthinkable that there was any intent to forbid, as such, publication by microfilm. To forbid publication by microfilm would logically also question publication by photographically reproduced microcards. It would then become a question of size of print on the one hand and material on which the letters appear on the other hand. This principle would tend then to outlaw publications in small type and/or on a more or less transparent medium. As costs of publication increase, probably publication by microfilm and microcards will become commonplace.

The case was adequately covered by my original proposal adopted at the last Congress in which it was provided, paragraph 2, that "Offer for sale of material that does not exist does not constitute effective publication." This was expressly designed to void

sleepers. The added last phrase in paragraph 1 wandered into a very different realm.

Art. 39

Delete paragraph 3 prohibiting publication in tradesmen's catalogs or in newspapers.

Argument:

This provision is impractical since it is virtually impossible to define "tradesmen's catalogues" and difficult to define newspaper. The publications of Charles Russell Orcutt were to some extent tradesmen's catalogs; the California Farmer and Journal of Useful Arts (2 (8): 58. 1854 (Aug.), *Washingtonia* Winslow) was in some degree a fortnightly newspaper.

Restriction of avenues of publication is the first step toward the creation of more Rafinesques and Marcus E. Joneses.

The requirement of a Latin diagnosis is a sound provision for both universality and prevention of irresponsible publication of new taxa by the casual dabbler who might publish in evanescent and unexpected channels.

Art. 43

(2) Delete: "On and from 1 Jan. 1953."

Argument: This paragraph, as passed at the last Congress, by implication leaves alternative names published prior to 1 Jan. 1953 with unstated but apparently valid status which means intolerable confusion. For example, it leaves the name of the Giant Sequoia of California in doubt. It had been fairly clear, until the last Congress, that the name should be *Sequoia Wellingtonia* Seemann, Bonplandia 3: 27. 1855; based on *Wellingtonia gigantea* Lindley, Gardener's Chron. 1853: 819. 1853, not *Sequoia gigantea* Endlicher, Synopsis Coniferarum, 197-8. 1847. However, now there is a possibility that *Sequoia washingtonianum* (Winslow) Sudworth, U.S. Dept. Agr. Div. For. Bull. 14: 61. 1897, based on *Taxodium Washingtonianum* Winslow, California Farmer and Journal of Useful Arts 2 (8): 58. 1854 (Aug.), is the correct name if it is intended to accept alternative names published prior to Jan. 1, 1953. Actually it is not clear whether Winslow's names *(Taxodium washingtonianum* and *Washingtonia californica)* are provisional or alternative names. Those who propose to distinguish between these two types of names would do well to study this case. Since the California Farmer and Journal of Useful Arts for 1854 is rare, most workers may find it more convenient to consult the following partial quotation of Dr. C. F. Winslow's article rather than trying to secure a microfilm or photostat of the original: The Big Tree (Wellingtonia gigantea, Lindl.). Hooker's Jour. Bot. & Kew Gard. Misc. 7: 26-29. 1855.

Comment: As now stated, the rest of paragraph 2 invalidates all or any names published with alternatives, and the alternatives are also rejected. The example given does not explain what is intended after 1 Jan. 1953.

Under this article as it was passed, the status of the following names is in doubt:

1. "*E.* (bezw. *Chamaesyce* [*nutans* var.?] *pseudonutans*" Thellung in Ascherson & Graebner, Syn. Mitteleur. Fl. 7: 431. 1917. (The quotation is *verbatim et literatim;* even the bracketed item was included. The *E.* stands for *Euphorbia.*)

2. "Gerbera (viridifolia var.?) Conrathii Thell. spec. vel var. nov." Vierteljahrschrift der Naturf. Gesell. in Zürich 68: 454. 1923.

Art. 74

Paragraph 3, change to read: "For purposes of homonymy, validly published names in all taxa *with the same rank* must be considered."

Argument:

As presently worded it is possible to interpret the rule as requiring intercategorical priority.

Art. 81

Add: "but typonymous with its basonym."

Argument:

This amendment will remove any doubt as to typification.

La nomenclature des hybrides intergénériques

Proposition n. 141 soumise au Congrès de Paris (1954)

par

Jacques Rousseau (Montréal)

Les articles 48, 49, H1 et H3 du Code international de nomenclature botanique adopté à Stockholm en 1950, régissent les noms d'hybrides interspécifiques ou intergénériques aussi bien les genres et espèces ordinaires. Faute de clarté dans les codes

antérieurs, la plupart des noms génériques proposés antérieurement pour les hybrides intergénériques sont invalides, faute d'une véritable diagnose. Sauf le cas où l'hybride intergénérique entre parfaitement dans le cadre d'un genre connu, le seul fait que l'auteur du nouveau nom générique le propose pour l'hybride de deux genres donnés implique que ses caractères sont grossièrement intermédiaires entre ceux des plantes-mères (car tous les caractères ne peuvent en pratique relever de gènes dominants). D'où impossibilité de placer le nouvel hybride dans l'un ou l'autre des deux genres en cause.

Pour éviter que l'application stricte des règles ne bouleverse inutilement la nomenclature, il semble opportun de soumettre pour étude au prochain congrès les amendements suivants:

1o. **Art. H3.** [*Premier paragraphe supplémentaire*]. Les noms génériques des hybrides intergénériques proposés avant 1950, sans être accompagnés de diagnose, sont valides si l'auteur indique les genres qui lui ont donné naissance, et s'il rattache à ce nouveau genre une entité spécifique accompagnée d'une description ou référant à une description effective. Exemples: G. Camus, in A. Camus (Bull. Mus. Nat. Hist. Nat., 6: 538. 1927) propose sans diagnose le nom générique *X Agroelymus - Agropyrum X Elymus*. Il y rattache immédiatement l' *X Agroelymus strictus - Triticum strictum* Deth., Consp. Fl. Megap. 11 (1828) et d'autres synonymes valides. Dans ce cas le nom générique *X Agroelymus* est valide. — Ascherson et Graebner (Syn. 2: 748. 1902) ont proposé le nom générique *Tritordeum*, sans diagnose, mais en indiquant qu'il était l'hybride *Triticum X Hordeum*, et en décrivant correctement deux espèces subordonnées (sans compter la référence à la synonymie valide). Dans ce cas le nom serait valide (s'il ne figure pas dans la liste des nomina rejicienda comme recommandé ailleurs).

Art. H3. [*Second paragraphe supplémentaire*]. Quand la description d'un hybride intergénérique entre parfaitement dans les cadres d'un genre régulièrement décrit, on ne doit pas proposer de nouveau nom générique pour hybride intergénérique, mais le décrire simplement comme une nouvelle entité spécifique hybride rattachée au dit genre. Ex. Si la description de l'hybride *Asplenium X Camptosorus* entre parfaitement dans les limites du genre *Asplenium* tel que décrit, le nouveau nom *X Aspleniosorus* devient invalide et l'entité spécifique hybride rattachée à ce genre doit être transférée dans le genre *Asplenium* en faisant toutefois précéder le nom du signe X.

2o. *Addition à la liste des nomina conservanda.* Le genre *Triticum*, tel que compris par Ascherson et Graebner, comprenait notamment les *Triticum* (sensu stricto) et les *Agropyron*, et leur genre *Hordeum* renfermait aussi bien les *Hordeum* (sensu stricto) que les *Elymus*. La conservation du nom *X Tritordeum* pour un hybride d'*Agropyron X Hordeum* (sensu stricto) ou d'*Agropyron X Elymus* pourrait être une cause de confusion surtout s'il y a lieu de distinguer ces plantes des hybrides de *Triticum* (sensu stricto) *X Hordeum* (sensu stricto). Pour cette raison, en revalidant certains noms d'hybrides intergénériques *, l'auteur a renoncé au genre *X Tritordeum*, pour choisir de préférence *X Agrohordeum* G. Camus (=*Agropyron X Hordeum*) et *X Agroelymus* G. Camus (=*Agropyron X Elymus*). Si l'on accepte l'amendement mentionné plus haut, il y aurait donc lieu d'ajouter à la liste des nomina conservanda *X Agrohordeum* G. Camus et *X Agroelymus* G. Camus, avec en regard le nomen rejiciendum *X Tritordeum*.

Si la liste des nomina conservanda était définitivement close antérieurement, le prochain auteur à traiter de ces hybrides pourrait quand même régler favorablement le problème en limitant par exemple le genre *X Tritordeum* Asch. & Graeb. aux hybrides d'*Agropyron X Hordeum* (d'autant plus que le premier *X Tritordeum* reconnu par Ascherson et Graebner était le *X Tritordeum Langei- Agropyron repens X Hordeum secalinum*), en conservant *X Agroelymus* pour les hybrides d'*Agropyron X Elymus* et en créant un nouveau nom, s'il y a lieu, pour les hybrides *Triticum* (sensu stricto) *X Hordeum* (sensu stricto).

---

* Rousseau, Jacques. La Validité des noms de quelques hybrides intergénériques de graminées. *Memoires du Jardin botanique de Montréal, No. 29, 24 pp.* Décembre 1952.

Recombination of Names of Infraspecific Taxa

by

Lyman Benson (Claremont, Calif.)

Use of the taxa subspecies and variety is inconsistent from one author to the next. Subspecies may mean a taxon of higher rank than variety and composed of one or more varieties as specified in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, but it may be the only taxon employed by an author for any infraspecific taxon. Variety may be employed for taxa below the rank of subspecies, but as with subspecies, it may be employed as the only recognized taxon below the rank of species. This inconsistency in usage of either subspecies or variety as the only recognized infraspecific category leads to many nomenclatural shifts in rank from subspecies to variety and vice versa.

In the writer's recent treatment of the North American species of *Ranunculus* (American Midland Naturalist, 40: 1-261. 1948) ninety-six species were recognized. Besides typical varieties, seventy-eight varieties were included. Only four or five of these have equivalent name combinations in subspecific rank, all these having been published recently. The same situation exists in innumerable genera. Varietal rank has been employed for many years when only one taxon below the rank of species has been recognized, but recently many botanists have adopted the practice of assigning the rank of subspecies to all varieties even though no reclassification was involved. Under the present rules, in a new rank a new epithet, once it is published, has priority over all others. Varieties should not be left vulnerable to changes of epithets because of differences in priority on transfer to subspecific rank. A similar situation in reverse exists in genera which have received full and careful monographing in recent years by those who use exclusively the rank of subspecies.

Proposal no. 142

New Art. 70bis

The priority of an epithet in all infraspecific ranks dates from its earliest valid publication in any infraspecific rank.

The name of a published infraspecific taxon is changed to any other infraspecific rank without change of author's citation. For example, *Ranunculus orthorhynchus* Hook. var. *platyphyllus* A. Gray becomes in subspecific rank *Ranunculus orthorhynchus* Hook. subsp. *platyphyllus* A. Gray. In formal monographic work the name of the original author may be followed by an indication of emended status by a later author and a reference to the place of publication. In manuals of local flora this is not necessary, but a statement of emended status may be included.

Note: In the first line of Article 70, insert after "infrageneric", "but not infraspecific".

Zur Nomenklatur der Lichenes

von

Fritz Mattick (Berlin-Dahlem)

Artikel 76 des International Code 1952 betrifft zwei ganz verschiedenartige Dinge, die nicht das geringste miteinander zu tun haben, nämlich 1.) Namen von Taxa, die sich als ein Gemisch nicht zusammengehöriger Elemente herausstellen, und 2.) die Nomenklatur der Lichenes. Es wäre daher zweckmässig, den Artikel 76 in zwei getrennte Artikel aufzulösen.

Der zweite die Flechten betreffende Absatz des Artikels 76 besagt Folgendes: "In der Nomenklatur sollen den Flechten gegebene Namen als sich auf ihre Pilzkomponente beziehend betrachtet werden". — Dies kann nicht unwidersprochen hingenommen werden, denn die Vertreter der Anschauung von der Selbständigkeit der Flechten sind bei der Abfassung dieser Regel offenbar gar nicht zu Worte gekommen. Da die Flechte nicht dasselbe ist wie der eine ihrer Symbiosepartner, kann der das Flechtenganze bezeichnende Name nicht auf den einen Teil übertragen werden (siehe Mattick 1951 a und b sowie 1953). Genauso wie die in Reinkultur gezogene Flechtenalge (die sich freilich verhältnismässig leicht mit einer frei

lebenden identifizieren lässt) ihren eigenen Namen hat, muss auch der Flechtenpilz den seinen erhalten. Als Beispiel: *Xanthoria parietina* ist die ganze Flechte; der aus ihren Sporen erhaltene algenfreie Pilz kann nicht auch *Xanthoria parietina* heißen. Man kann ihn höchstens, wie es schon vielfach geschehen ist, *Xanthoriomyces parietinae* nennen. Im Verhältnis zu der riesigen Zahl der Flechten, deren Pilz niemals frei lebend beobachtet worden ist, sind die Fälle, in denen ein Pilz sowohl frei lebend wie auch zusammen mit einer Alge als Flechte vorkommen kann, ganz wenige. Und in diesen Fällen hat ja der Pilz schon seinen eigenen Namen. Ich schlage daher vor, dass die obige Regel wie folgt abgeändert wird:

Proposal 143

Art. 76(2)

"In der Nomenklatur gelten die Flechtennamen immer für die Flechte als Ganzes. Will man die Flechtenkomponenten getrennt bezeichnen, so bekommt die Flechtenalge den Namen, den sie im frei lebenden Zustand trägt, während dem Pilz (falls er nicht auch frei vorkommt und schon seinen eigenen Namen hat) der Gattungsname der Flechte mit der angehängten Endung *-myces* gegeben wird, unter Zufügung des in den Genitiv gesetzten Artnamens der Flechte".

Zitierte Literatur:

Mattick, Fr.: Wuchs- und Lebensformen, Bestand- und Gesellschaftsbildung der Flechten. — Botan. Jahrbücher, 75 (3): 378-424. 1951.

——: Alte und neue Probleme der Lichenologie. — Ber. Deutsch. Bot. Ges. 64: 93-107. 1951.

——: Lichenologische Notizen. — Ber. Deutsch. Bot. Ges. 66: 263-276. 1953. — Darin: 5. Zur Nomenklatur der Flechten, S. 275-276.

Various Proposals

Proposal no. 144

Rec. 19B

Delete Rec. 19B and insert a *new Article* 19 bis:

"On and from 1 Jan. 1955 the original material, especially the holotype must be scrupulously conserved and be deposited in a permanent responsible institution. Living material cannot be designated as a type".

Art. 21 (note 1)

Modify as follows:

Up to and including 31 Dec. 1954 the type may be a figure and/or a description for plants of which no type specimen exists.

Argument: New species of cacti and other succulent plants are often described from living specimens in botanical gardens or private collections. When such a plant dies nothing guarantees the preservation of the material. This will cause errors in the future as it did in the past (types of Salm-Dyck, etc.).

Proposed by: P. A. Florschütz, Utrecht.

Proposal no. 145

Art. 23

Delete paragraph f; in paragraph e for the enumeration of groups substitute "**Fungi caeteri**". The provision concerning the starting-point for the Fungi other than Myxomycetes will then read: "e. **Fungi caeteri**, 31 Dec. 1801 (Persoon, *Synopsis Methodica Fungorum*").

Argument: The system of multiple starting-points for Fungi has long been a source of confusion, and in its application has led to unusual bibliographic difficulties and labor. The confusion has been eliminated by the unambiguous formulation adopted at Stockholm; but the other difficulties remain. As an example, there are sound bases for differences of opinion whether certain Fungi are Agaricales (1821) or Gasteromycetes (1801). As a second, widely-accepted names published in excellent works a little earlier than the *Systema Mycologicum* or contemporary with it are displaced, or, what is worse, altered in their application, by the manner in which they were compiled for the *Systema*. Adoption of a starting-point later than 1821 can serve only to consign to limbo still more of the often admirable work (and generally-employed names) of early-nineteenth-century authors. The *Synopsis* of Persoon bears the same relation to the taxonomy of the Fungi that the *Species Plantarum* bears to that of seed-plants: it is the first ordered and comprehensive treatment of all the generally recognized taxa known at the time of publication. Its adoption

as the starting-point for Fungi would occasion no more, and might well occasion less, alteration in the current nomenclature than the conscientious application of the present Art. 23 or of any other starting-point. The Myxomycetes, whose nomenclature is well stabilized under the present Art. 23H, had best retain their present starting-point.

Proposed by: W. W. Diehl, G. W. Martin, D. P. Rogers, Rolf Singer, J. A. Stevenson.

Proposal no. 146

Art. 32

For "subgenus" substitute the words "subdivision of a genus".

Argument: The principle of applying a name of a taxon to the type subdivision, already adopted in Art. 35 for all subdivisions of a species, should be extended not merely to the subgenus, as by the present Art. 32, but equally to all subdivisions of the genus.

Proposed by: D. P. Rogers.

Proposal no. 147

Art. 33

Add the following to the examples after the third paragraph: "*Stagonospora arenaria* Sacc. from the host *Elymus arenarius, Cercospora monoica* Ell. & Holw. from *Amphicarpa monoica, Peridermium balsameum* Peck from *Abies balsamea;* but also *Gloeosporium balsameae* J. J. Davis, *Phacidium balsameae* J. J. Davis, from *Abies balsamea, Taphrina sacchari* Jenkins from *Acer saccharum.*"

Argument: The examples above include those cases where the specific epithet is adjectival in form but is used as a substantive.

Proposed by: I. L. Conners, Ottawa.

Proposal no. 148

Sous-section 5. NOMS DE MACRO-ESPECES (NOMS BINAIRES)

Art. 33

Un nom de "*macro-espèce*", est une combinaison binaire, etc. (du reste comme dans l'Article 33 du Code 1952).

Raisonnement: Ce qu'on nomme *espèces,* ne sont pas des véritables espèces, mais des macro-espèces, c'est à dire, des groupes des espèces très peu dissemblables, qu'on a fréquemment l'habitude d'appeller improprement sous-espèces, malgré qu'elles sont des vraies espèces avec des caractères constants et héréditaires.

Une macro-espèce peut d'ailleurs être monotypique et se réduire à une seule espèce, comme une famille ou un genre peut comprendre qu'une seule espèce.

Exemple: *Ginkgo biloba* L., loin d'être une véritable espèce, est un groupe d'espèces très peu dissemblables, dont l'unique représentant actuellement vivante est le *Ginkgo biloba biloba* L., les autres ayant disparu à des époques géologiques antérieures. On peut même supposer pour les divers cas des macro-espèces monotypiques.

Sous-section 6. NOMS D'ESPECES (NOMS TERNAIRES)

Art. 34

Un nom d'espèce est une combinaison ternaire entre le nom de la macro-espèce et l'épithète formée comme celle des macro-espèces et ajoutée à celle-ci.

Exemples: *Ginkgo biloba biloba* L; *Viscum album album* L; *Viscum album laxum* B. R.

Raisonnement: D'après le raisonnement de l'article 33 et les progrès considérables de la Systématique moderne, il faudrait établir en tous cas pour la véritable espèce une nomenclature trinominale.

Sous-section 7. NOMS DE TAXA INFRA-SPECIFIQUES

Art. 35

C'est l'article 34 du Code (1952) mais en ajoutant au paragraphe final "il est permis de réduire les combinaisons trop compliquées à des combinaisons ternaires", "*pourvu qu'on exprime le rang des taxa subordonnés.*"

Proposé par: Cayetano Cortés Latorre.

Proposal no. 149

Art. 44

Add the following example:

"*Schidaea Gregoriana* Degener, Fl. Hawaiiensis, fam. 119, 1936 (Apr. 9) and *S. kealiae* Kaum & Hosaka, Bernice P. Bishop Mus. Occas. Papers 11, no. 23: 3. 1936 (Apr. 10) were proposed for the same plant; and the type of the former is a part of the original material of the latter. Since the name *S. Gregoriana* is not accompanied by a Latin diagnosis, the later *S. kealiae* is the legitimate name."

Argument: It appears desirable to add emphasis to this important rule by an example.

Proposed by: D. P. Rogers.

Proposal no. 150

Rec. 60F

Misidentifications are only too frequently cited in the synonymy by attributing a misapplied name to the author responsible for the misidentification and by listing, without comment, such a misapplied name with its illegitimate author citation among the synonyms. The Code rightly deprecates this practice and Recommendation 60F reads:

Misidentifications should not be included in the synonymy but added after it. A misapplied name should be indicated by the words *'auct. non'* followed by the name of the original author and the bibliographical references.

The meaning of 'the bibliographical references' in this Recommendation is ambiguous and the ambiguity is not lessened, for a non-specialist at least, by the specimen synonymy given in the Example (not 'Examples').

The meaning could be clarified by modifying the last few words of the Recommendation to read '... *'auct. non'* followed by the name of the original author and by the name of the author and the biographical reference of the misidentification'.

Also, in the Example the names of the author of the name and the author responsible for the misapplication might usefully be separated by a colon i.e. '*F. exasperata* auct. non Vahl: De Wild. & Th. Dur...'.

Proposed by: G. C. Ainsworth, Exeter.

Proposal no. 151

Arts 65(1b) & 79(3)

Die am letzten Botanischen Kongreß angenommenen Änderungen der Nomenklatur-Regeln spiegeln die Auffassung immer weiterer Kreise von Systematikern und Floristen wieder, daß lateinische Namen im wesentlichen möglichst stabile und eindeutig gegebene *Bezeichnungen* für die verschiedenen pflanzlichen Sippen der Organismen sein sollen. Zugunsten dieses Prinzipes wurden zahlreiche Änderungsvorschläge abgewiesen, in denen gefordert wurde, daß lateinische Namen unbedingt auch "sinnvolle", "orthographisch und grammatikalisch richtige" und "praktischen Bedürfnissen weitgehend entsprechende" Gebilde sein müßten. Trotz dieser klaren Grundeinstellung wird seit 1905 eine Regel mitgeschleppt (Art. 79(3) und 65 (1b), die besagt, daß gültig veröffentlichte und legitime Artnamen mit Prioritätsrecht nur deshalb verworfen werden müssen, weil sie mit dem Gattungsnamen gleichlauten, also Tautonyme sind. Gegen diese Regel müssen eine ganze Anzahl von Einwänden erhoben werden.

1.) Der wesentlichste Grund für die Ausschaltung der Tautonyme ist offensichtlich der, daß es sich hier um "wenig sinnvolle" Wiederholungen des Gattungsnamens als Artbezeichnung handelt. Dem kann nur entgegengehalten werden, daß *noch viel weniger sinnvolle Namen,* wie etwa *Phleum phleoides, Alyssum alyssoides, Luzula luzulina,* etc. *beibehalten werden.*

2.) Nach den Nomenklatur-Regeln müssen Subgenera, welche die typische Art beinhalten (Art. 32) und alle subspezifischen Einheiten, welche den Typus der Art beinhalten (Art. 35), den Namen der übergeordneten Kategorie, also der Gattung bzw. der Art, *unverändert wiederholen.* Warum findet diese Regel nicht auch für dazwischen liegende Kategorie der Spezies — wenigstens teilweise — Anwendung?

3.) Bei der heute weithin gebräuchlichen Anwendung eines engeren Gattungsbegriffes und der daraus folgenden Aufsplitterung größerer Gattungen ergibt sich vielfach die Notwendigkeit, gut bekannte und klar typifizierte Artnamen mit Prioritätsrecht nur wegen ihres Gleichklanges mit dem neuen Gattungsnamen aufzugeben und durch neue Namen oder ± unsichere bzw. unbekannte Synonyme zu ersetzen (z.B. kann bei der Überführung von *Galium cruciata* L. (und verwandter Arten) zur Gattung *Cruciata* nicht der klar belegte Name Linné's verwendet werden, sondern es muß eine neue Kombination auf *Valantia chersonensis* Willd. — eine Bezeichnung für eine untypische Teilsippe — begründet werden).

4.) In der zoologischen Nomenklatur werden Tautonyme seit jeher ohne irgendwelche nachteilige Folgen verwendet.

Auf Grund dieser Argumente beantrage ich, *die Einschränkung der Gültigkeit tautonymer Artnamen aufzuheben* und *Artikel 65(1b)* ("or a tautonym") *und 79(3)* ("when they exactly repeat the generic name with or without addition of a transcribed symbol") *zu streichen.*

Proposed by: F. Ehrendorfer, Wien.

Proposal no. 152

Art. 73(8)

Binary names for subdivisions of genera are illegitimate.

Examples: The following are illegitimate: *Alchemilla vulgaris* agg. (L.) Clapham, Tutin & Warburg, Fl. Brit. Is. 505. 1952, an aggregate including eleven species.

Argument: The use of binary nomenclature for taxa subordinate to species is illegitimate by Art. 34. A similar prohibition, like that here proposed, is needed to eliminate binomials published for taxa higher than species.

Proposed by: A. R. H. Lamberton.

Proposal no. 153

Art. 82

Add the following note:

"Note 2 A. When a substantive is used as a specific or infraspecific epithet to indicate a host of a parasite, the use of the nominative, instead of the genitive, is treated as an orthographic error.

Example: *Puccinia coronata* Corda f. sp. *agrostis* Erikss. should be corrected to *Puccinia coronata* Corda f. sp. *agrostidis* Erikss. as the substantive *Agrostis* is the generic name of the host of this forma specialis of *Puccinia coronata* and should therefore be used in the genitive."

Argument: It is traditional to use the genitive when a substantive is chosen for a specific or infraspecific epithet to indicate a host of the parasite. Examples are: *Pseudopeziza medicaginis* (Lib.) Sacc. for the host Medicago; *Puccinia phlei-pratensis* Erikss. for the host *Phleum pratense; Puccinia graminis* Pers. for the host *gramen*, a grass; *Puccinia trifoliorum* de Bary for the hosts, *trifolia*, clovers; *Boletus tulipiferae* Schw. (*Polyporus tulipiferae* (Schw.) Overh., not *P. tulipiferus*) for the host *Liriodendron tulipifera;* and *Ramularia virgaureae* Thüm. for the host, *Solidago virgaurea*. Failure to use consistently the genitive has led to confusion. Eriksson correctly formed *Puccinia coronata* f. sp. *avenae* from the host *Avena, P. coronata* f. sp. *alopecuri* from the host *Alopecurus,* and *P. coronata* f. sp. *calamagrostidis* from the host *Calamagrostis*. Klebahn changed the latter name to *P. coronata* f. sp. *calamagrostis,* although he proposed correctly *P. coronata* f. sp. *phalaridis* from the host *Phalaris*.

Proposed by: I. L. Conners.

Proposal no. 154

Rec. 82 G

For the present recommendation substitute the following: "The use of small or capital letters, being a matter of typography and not of nomenclature, is not subject to the rules of nomenclature".

Argument: The purpose of this proposal is to eliminate explicitly from the Code any rule or recommendation concerning capitalization. It will therefore relieve those botanists who prefer to follow a rule of thumb and to decapitalize from any obligation to consider the grammatical or historical antecedents of an epithet. It will equally relieve from the obligation to follow an arbitrary precept those who object to the grammatical absurdity of capitalizing a name in the nominative case (*Allium*) but not in the genitive (*Puccinia Allii*), or who wish to employ the available means of indicating why an apparent adjective does not agree in gender with the preceding noun (*Schinus "mollis", Polyporus "tulipiferus"; Sedum "roseum"*). It will likewise eliminate from the Code a prescription in favor of such fantastic titles as "THE GROWTH OF NITZSCHIA lINEARIS".

Proposed by: H. A. Gleason & D. P. Rogers.

Proposal no. 155

Rec. 83 A

In provision (3), before "used as generic names", insert the words "or adjectives whose gender is not apparent"; and add to the examples: "*Claviceps* Link (Handb. Gew. 3: 346. 1833) is adjectival in form and has no classical gender; Link assigned to it *C. capitatus* etc., and *Claviceps* should therefore be treated as masculine."

Argument: The example illustrates the need for such a provision.

Proposed by: D. P. Rogers.

Proposal no. 156

Proposal to delete **Persea** from the list of Nomina Generica Conservanda.

Argument: A description of the genus *Persea* was validly published by Miller in Gardeners Dictionary, edition 7, 1759. It is based upon the description on page 44 of Plumier's Nova Plantarum Americanarum, 1703, and tab. 20 in the same work. *Persea* of Gaertner in Fructibus et Seminibus Plantarum 3: 222, 1805, was based on the same

work. It is therefore unnecessary to conserve *Persea* over *Farnesia* of Heister in Fabricius, Enumeratio Methodica Plantarum Horti Medici Helmstadiensis edition 2, page 400, 1763, since the name *Persea* antedates *Farnesia.*

Note: Since the above proposal was formulated, the article by Mansfeld in the November issue of Taxon was brought to my attention. He discusses the presence of *Persea* on the conserved list, and says in effect that if we recognize Gaertner as the author of *Persea,* we cannot use the specific epithet *americana* (Miller, Gardeners Dictionary, edition 8. 1768.), but we must use the later combination *Persea gratissima* Gaertner (loc. cit.) which is an isonym of the former name. This is not a valid argument because we do not conserve specific names. The situation will be remedied, however, if Persea is removed from the list of conserved names.

Proposed by: Lucille E. Kopp (New York).

Proposal no. 157

Proposal for corrections to 2261 **Suaeda** and 3553 **Pterolobium**, their references to read as follows:

Suaeda Forsk. ex Scop. Introd. Hist. Nat. 333 (1777), excl. verba falsa "Capsula quinquevalvis ... polysperma".

Pterolobium R. Br. ex Wight & Arn. Prodr. Fl. Ind. Or. 1: 283(1834).

Argument: On p. 101 of the International Code, 1952, *Suaeda* Forsk. Fl. Aegypt. Arab. 69 *t. 18.* 1775 is conserved against *Dondia* Adans. and *Lerchea* Rueling.

On p. 108, *Pterolobium* R. Br. in Salt, Abyss. App. 64(1814) is conserved against *Cantuffa* J. F. Gmel.

However, neither *Suaeda* nor *Pterolobium* were generically described in the works mentioned. It is evidently not the intention that *nomina nuda* should be conserved, and the reasonable solution is that these names should still be conserved, but with the places of their first valid publication correctly given. They appear to be as proposed above.

Proposed by: J. P. M. Brenan (Kew).

Proposal no. 158

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name **Murdannia** (Commelinaceae). Nom. cons. prop.: *Murdannia* Royle, Illustr. Bot. Himal. 403(1840) *t. 95 fig. 3*(1839).

Type species: *M. scapiflora* Royle: ac. to Stearn, J. Arn. Arb. 24: 485. 1943.

Adopted by: Brückner in Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. ed. 2. 15A: 173 (1930); Lemée, Dict. Gen. Pl. Phan. 4: 591 (1932); Handel-Mazzetti, Symb. Sin. 7: 1243. 1936; Santapau in Poona Agric. Coll. Mag. 41(4): 15(1951); Brenan in Kew Bull. 1952: 179 et seq. (1952).

Size and area: about 34 species or more, in tropical Africa and Asia, Australia and South America.

Nom. rej. prop.: (1) *Dilasia* Raf., Fl. Tellur. 4: 122(1836).

Type species: *D. vaginata* (L.) Raf. (= *Murdannia vaginata* (L.) Brückn.).

Adopted by: Pichon in Not. Syst. (Paris) 12: 236(1946).

(2) *Streptylis* Raf., Fl. Tellur. 4: 122(1836).

Type species: *S. bracteolata* Raf. (= *Murdannia spirata* (L.) Brückn.).

Adopted by: nobody since its publication.

Discussion: According to Stearn's bibliographical note in J. Arnold Arb. 24: 485(1943) *Murdannia* was first published in 1839, as a monotypic new genus based on a new species, by the provision of a plate with analyses showing essential characters; the description did not appear until more than a year later, in 1840. Only one valid combination, Rafinesque's original one, has been made under *Dilasia,* while *Streptylis* has been adopted by nobody but its author.

If, following Pichon, *Dilasia* is accepted as the valid name for this genus then at least 33 new combinations are necessary. To avoid this, *Murdannia* is proposed for conservation.

Proposed by: J. P. M. Brenan (Kew).

Proposal no. 159

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name **Piliostigma** (Leguminosae).

Piliostigma Hochst. in Flora 29: 598 (1846) versus: *Elayuna* Raf., Sylva Tellur. 145 (1838).

Piliostigma Hochst., Leguminosae.

Adopted by: Bentham in Miq. Pl. Jungh. 261 (1852); Milne-Redhead in Hook. Ic. Pl. *t. 3460* (1947); F. W. Andrews, Fl. Pl. A.-E. Sudan 2: 127 (1952); Brenan, Check-List, Tanganyika Territory, 2: 650 (1949); Keay, An Outline of Nigerian Vegetation (1949); Keay in Journ. Ecol. 37: 335-364 (1949); Grandvaux Barbosa, Esboço da Ve-

getaçao da Zambézia (1952); Eggeling, Indigenous Trees of the Uganda Protectorate, ed. 2 (1952); Wild, A guide to the Flora of the Victoria Falls (1953).

2 species in tropical Africa and 1 species in tropical Asia.

Type species: *Piliostigma reticulatum* (DC.) Hochst. (1846), based on *Bauhinia reticulata* DC. (1825).

Elayuna Raf., Leguminosae.

Not, apparently, adopted by any author except Rafinesque himself.

Type species: *Elayuna biloba* Raf. (1838), based on *Bauhinia tamarindacea* Del. (1826) which is a synonym of *B. reticulata* DC. (1825).

Discussion: Although *Piliostigma* has only recently been restored as a genus distinct from *Bauhinia*, the name has long been used for a section of *Bauhinia*. The name *Piliostigma* has rapidly become well-known among botanists working on the flora of tropical Africa. Although there are only two species, the genus is widespread and abundant in tropical Africa and is of considerable ecological importance. *Elayuna* has been completely ignored, and new combinations would be needed for all three species if *Piliostigma* is not conserved.

Proposed by: R. W. J. Keay (Kew).

Proposal no. 160

Proposal that the name **Dracocephalum** L. emend. Benth. (1830) be conserved against *Dracocephalum* L. emend. Adans. (1763) et Moench (1794).

Tournefort, Inst. Rei Herb. (1700) recognised two genera, *Dracocephalum* (p. 181, *t. 83*) and *Moldavica* (p. 184, *t. 85*).

Linnaeus, Gen. Pl. 173 (1737) united them under the name *Dracocephalum* with the remark that the characters used to separate them were not of generic value. In his Hortus Upsalensis 1: 16 (1748) Linnaeus added a species which had previously been assigned to another genus *Rhuyschiana* Amm. Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 594-6 (1753) included in *Dracocephalum* 11 species (raised to 13 in ed. 2, 1762), drawn from the three abovementioned genera.

Adanson, Fam. Pl. 2 (1763) segregated *Dracocephalum* L. into three genera, *Dracocephalum* Tournef., *Moldavica* Tournef. and *Rhuyschiana* Amm. which he referred respectively to the first, second, and third sections into which he divided the family *Labiatae*. He gave references to the pre-Linnean literature and set out the diagnostic characters of the genera in tabular form. Adanson did not indicate any types for his generic names, but so far as *Dracocephalum* is concerned there is no difficulty since Tournefort had only the one species under that name, and this species, which was named *Dracocephalum virginianum* by Linnaeus, is the type of the name *Dracocephalum* L. emend. Adans.

Miller, Gard. Dict. ed. 8 (1768) followed Linnaeus in treating *Moldavica* as a synonym of *Dracocephalum*, but followed Adanson in maintaining *Rhuyschiana* as a distinct genus.

Moench, Method. Pl. 409-412 (1794) did not deal with *Rhuyschiana*, but the other species which Linnaeus had included under *Dracocephalum* he segregated into 4 genera. He followed Adanson in recognising *Moldavica* Tournef. as a distinct genus, but distributed the species which Tournefort had included in it among three genera, *Moldavica*, *Zornia*, and *Cedronella*. Tournefort had originally (Inst. Rei Herb. 184) four species under *Moldavica* and of these one was named *D. canariense* by Linnaeus and two placed by him in *D. Moldavica* L. In 1703 Tournefort added seven more species to *Moldavica* (Coroll. Inst. Rei Herb. 11: 1703), and of these two were named by Linnaeus as *D. canescens* and *D. peltatum*. Now of these Tournefortian species, Moench placed *D. Moldavica* L. under *Moldavica* Tournef., (along with one other species, the *D. sibiricum* of Linne), *D. canariense* was the sole species of a new genus *Cedronella* Moench, while the other two species (*D. canescens* and *D. peltatum*) he referred to his other new genus *Zornia*. It is thus clear that *Dracocephalum* L. emend. Adans. (et Moench) and *Moldavica* [Tournef.] Adans. sensu Moench are typified respectively by *D. virginianum* L. and D. *moldavica* L., while the type of *Cedronella* Moench is *D. canariense* L.

Other botanists of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries did not follow the lead given by Adanson and Moench, but preferred to group all the species under the one genus *Dracocephalum* L. In 1829-30, however, Bentham published a synopsis of the *Labiatae* in the Botanical Register (sub *t. 1282, 1289, 1292*) and in this he removed *D. virginianum* L. from *Dracocephalum* and established it as a distinct genus *Physostegia* (Bot. Reg. sub *t. 1289*, 1829). Five years later Bentham elaborated his work (Labiatae, 490-501, 1834). Of the numerous species that had

been referred to *Dracocephalum*, he recognised 35 as distinct and these he assigned as follows:

Dracocephalum L. emend. Benth. (syn. *Moldavica* Moench, *Zornia* Moench, *Rhuyschiana* Mill.): 27 species, two with some doubt.

Physostegia Benth.: 1 species, *P. virginianum* (L.) Benth.

Cedronella Moench: 3 species, including *C. canariense* (L.).

Nepeta L.: 3 species.

Sphaceïe Benth. 1 species.

It will be obvious that *Physostegia* Benth. is *Dracocephalum* L. emend. Adans., and that *Dracocephalum* L. emend. Benth. is *Moldavica* Adans. In other words, Bentham, like Adanson and Moench, recognised that *D. virginianum* L. was generically distinct from the rest of the species included under the name *Dracocephalum*. But, unlike them, he would have had to provide new combinations for more than 20 species had he adopted the name *Dracocephalum* for *D. virginianum*, and though he was doubtless aware that that species was the type of the name *Dracocephalum*, he obviously decided that it would cause less inconvenience to rename that one species than to rename more than twenty. With few exceptions, subsequent workers followed Bentham, and consequently practically all the literature under *Dracocephalum* refers to *Moldavica* species, whilst that concerning the true *Dracocephalum* (*D. virginianum* L.) is under *Physostegia*.

Britton and Brown, Ill. Fl. Northern States and Canada, ed. 2. 3: 114-6 (1913) followed Adanson and recognised *Moldavica* with *D. moldavica* L. as the type, and *Dracocephalum* with *D. virginianum* L. as type, and they have been followed by Rydberg Fl. Rocky Mts. (1917), and Fl. Prairies and Plains Central N. Amer. (1932), by Small, Man. Southeastern Fl. (1933) and by Kearney & Peebles, Flow. Pl. & Ferns Arizona (1942). Nevertheless these authors have dealt with very few species, and though they have recognised a few other species besides *D. virginianum* in *Dracocephalum* L. emend. Adanson, they have made no attempt to deal with the upwards of 90 species which ought to be transferred to *Moldavica*. In fact to this day only three species have received names in *Moldavica*. To rename upwards of 90 species now would be highly inconvenient, and it is suggested that the name *Dracocephalum* L. emend. Benth. be retained for those species, and that *D. virginianum* and its allies should receive the name *Physostegia* Benth.

It is therefore proposed that the name *Dracocephalum* L. emend. Benth. (type *D. moldavica* L.) be placed on the list of Nomina Generica Conservanda.

Proposed by: J. R. Sealy (Kew).

Proposal no. 161

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name 6729 **Chlorocodon** Hook. f. (1871) of the Asclepiadaceae versus *Chlorocodon* Fourreau in Ann. Soc. Linn. Lyon, n.s. 17: 113 (1869) of the Ericaceae.

Chlorocodon Hook. f. in Bot. Mag. *t.* 5898 (1871); Benth. in Benth. et Hook. f. Gen. Pl. 2: 745 (1876); Baill. Hist. Pl. 10: 293 (1891); K. Schum. in Engl. et Prantl, Natürl. Pflanzenfam. 4(2): 215 (1895); Schltr. in Journ. Bot. 34: 314 (1896); N. E. Br. in Thiselton-Dyer, Fl. Trop. Afr. 4(1): 254 (1902), et in Thiselton-Dyer, Fl. Cap. 4(1): 541 (1907); Phillips, Gen. S. Afr. Fl. Pl. ed. 2, 594 (1951).

Type species: *Chlorocodon whitei* Hook. f. l.c.

Size and area: A genus of two or three species, confined to tropical and subtropical Africa.

Recognition: Accepted as correct in all relevant works.

Chlorocodon Fourreau in Ann. Soc. Linn Lyon, n.s. 17: 113 (1869).

Type species: *Chlorocodon scoparium* (Linn.) Fourreau, l.c.

Size, area and recognition: The genus is based on *Erica* sect. *Chlorocodon* DC. in DC. Prodr. 7: 692 (1839), where two species, *E. scoparia* Linn. from southern Europe and *E. coarctata* Wendl. from South Africa are listed.

Discussion: Fourreau published only one binomial under *Chlorocodon* and the generic status has never been accepted. Guthrie and Bolus (in Thiselton-Dyer, Fl. Cap. 4(1): 214: 1905) listed seven species under *Erica* sect. *Chlorocodon*, but did not mention Fourreau's generic name. *Chlorocodon* Hook. f., on the other hand, has been universally accepted in taxonomic and ecological works and there is no doubt that the substitution for it of the hitherto overlooked name *Mondia* Skeels (in U.S. Dep. Agric. Bur. Pl. Industry, Bull. No. 223, 45: 1911) would cause inconvenience.

Recommendation: To conserve *Chlorocodon* Hook. f. over its earlier homonym *Chlorocodon* Fourreau.

Proposed by: A. A. Bullock.

Proposal no. 162

Proposal for the conservation of the genus **Pholiota** (Fr.) Kumm. vs. *Derminus* (Fr.) Staude.

Nom. cons. prop. *Pholiota* (Fr.) Kumm. Führ. Pilzk. 22, 83. 1871.

T.: *Agaricus squarrosus* Muell. ex Fr.

Nom. rej. prop. *Derminus* (Fr.) Staude, Schwämme Mitteldeutschl. xxvi, 66. 1857.

T.: *Agaricus squarrosus* Muell. ex Fr.

Information and argumentation: submitted to the Rapporteur.

Proposed by: M. A. Donk (Bogor).

Nomenclature committees

Special Committee for Pteridophyta and Phanerogamae

Subcommittee for Pteridophyta

Secretary: Prof. Dr. R. E. G. Pichi-Sermolli, Herbarium Universitatis Florentinae, Istituto Botanico, Via Lamarmora 4, *Firenze*, Italy.

The Secretary has circulated among the Members of the Subcommittee the second and last part of the reports prepared by him on the generic names proposed for conservation. After having received members' comments and circulated them, the Subcommittee proceeded to the voting on the proposals for conservation, which gave the following results:

NOMINA CONSERVANDA PROPOSITA	NOMINA REJICIENDA PROPOSITA
Anemia Sw. Syn. Fil. 6, 155. 1806.	*Ornithopteris* Bernh. Schrad. Neu. Journ. **1** (2): 40. 1806.
T.: *A. phyllitidis* (L.) Sw.	T.: *O. adiantifolia* (L.) Bernh.

Votes: In favour of conservation **6**; Against conservation **0**; Abstention **1**.

Araiostegia Copel. Philip. Journ. Sci. **34**: 240. 1927.	*Gymnogrammitis* Griff. Icon. Pl. As. **2**: *pl. 129 f. 1.* 1849; Not. Pl. As. **2**: 608. 1849.
T.: *A. hymenophylloides* (Bl.) Copel.	T.: *G. dareiformis* (Hk.) Ching

Votes: In favour of conservation **5**. Against conservation, since *Araiostegia* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved: **2**. — 1 vote against the typification of *Gymnogrammitis* on *G. dareiformis*.

Aspidium Sw. Schrad. Journ. **1800** (2): 29. 1801.	*Tectaria* Cav. Anal. Hist. Nat. **1**(2): 115. 1799.
T.: the most eligible: *A. trifoliatum* (L.) Sw.	T.: *T. trifoliata* (L.) Cav.

Votes: In favour of conservation **1**; Against conservation **6**.

Cheilanthes Sw. Syn. Fil. 5, 126. 1806.	*Allosorus* Bernh. Schrad. Neu. Journ. **1**(2): 36. 1806.
T.: *C. micropteris* Sw.	T.: *A. pusillus* (Willd.) Bernh.

Votes: In favour of conservation **6**; Against conservation, since *Cheilanthes* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **1**.

Coniogramme Fée, Gen. Fil. 167. 1852.	*Dictyogramme* Fée, Mém. Soc. Mus. Hist. Nat. Strasbourg **4**(1): 202. 1850; Gen. Fil. 170. 1852.
T.: *C. javanica* (Bl.) Fée [*C. fraxinea* (Don) Diels].	T.: *D. japonica* (Thunb.) Fée
	Notogramme Presl, Epim. Bot. 263. 1851.
	T.: *N. japonica* (Thunb.) Presl

Votes: The conservation of *Coniogramme* was unanimously adopted by the Subcommittee [see Taxon **2** (1): 12. 1953]. The addition of *Dictyogramme* in the list of Nomina Rejicienda is adopted with **6** votes in favour and **1** against.

Cryptogramma R. Br. apud Richard in Franklin, Narr. Journ. 767. 1823.
T.: *C. acrostichoides* R. Br.

Allosorus Bernh. Schrad. Neu. Journ. **1**(2): 36. 1806.
T.: *A. crispus* (L.) Röhling

Votes: In favour of conservation **2**; Against conservation, since *Cryptogramma* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **5**.

Ctenopteris (Bl.) Kze. Bot. Zeit. **4**: 425. 1846.
T.: *C. venulosa* (Bl.) Kze.

Xiphopteris Kaulf. Jahrb. f. Pharm. **21**: 35 (1820); Enum. Fil. 85. 1824.
T.: *X. serrulata* (Sw.) Kaulf.
Prosaptia Presl, Tent. Pterid. 165. 1836.
T.: *P. pinnatifida* Presl

Votes: In favour of conservation **2**; Against conservation **5**.

Danaea Sm. Mém. Acad. Sci. Turin **5**: 420. 1793.
T.: *D. nodosa* (L.) Sm.

Danaa All. Fl. Pedem. **2**: 34. pl. 63. 1785.
T.: *D. aquilegifolia* All. [*D. cornubiensis* (Torn.) Burnat].

Votes: In favour of conservation **7**; Against conservation **0**.

Drymoglossum Presl, Tent. Pterid. 227. *pl. 10, f. 5, 6.* 1836.
T.: *D. piloselloides* (L.) Presl.

Pteropsis Desv. Mém. Soc. Linn. Paris **6**: 218. 1827.
T.: *P. heterophylla* (L.) Desv.

Votes: In favour of conservation **5**; Against conservation, since *Drymoglossum* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **1**; Abstention 1. —)1 vote against the typification of *Pteropsis* on *P. heterophylla* [*Pteropsis scolopendrina* (Bory) Desv. is substituted for it].

Hymenolepis Kaulf. Enum. Fil. 146. 1824.
T.: *H. ophioglossoides* Kaulf.
[*H. spicata* (L.f.) Presl].

Hymenolepis Cass. Bull. Soc. Philom. Paris 138. 1817.
T.: *H. parviflora* (Murr.) DC.
Belvisia Mirbel, Hist. Nat. Pl. **4**: 65. 1803; Hist. Nat. Vég. **3**: 473, **5**: 111. 1803.
T.: *B. spicata* (L.f.) Copel.

Votes: In favour of conservation **1**; Against conservation **6**. — 1 vote against the typification of *Belvisia* on *B. spicata* [*Belvisia septentrionalis* (L.) is substituted for it].
With **5** votes in favour and **2** against the Subcommittee considers that *Belvisia* (with *Acrostichum spicatum* L.f. as its lectotype) is the correct name for the present genus.

Lastrea Bory, Dict. Class. Hist. Nat. **6**: 588. 1824; **9**: 232. 1826.
T.: *L. oreopteris* (Ehrh.) Bory *

Thelypteris Schmidel, Icon. pl. ed. Keller 45. *pl. 11, 13.* ? 1762.
T.: *T. palustris* Schott

Votes: In favour of conservation **2**; Against conservation **4**; Against conservation, since *Lastrea* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **1**.

Lygodium Sw. Schrad. Journ. **1800**(2): 106. 1801.
T.: *L. scandens* (L.) Sw.

Ramondia Mirbel, Bull. Sci. Soc. Philom. Paris **2**(47): 179. 1801.
T.: *R. flexuosa* (L.) Mirbel
Ugena Cav. Icon. Descr. Pl. **6**: 73. 1801.
T.: *U. semihastata* Cav.

* Very probably the epithet "*oreopteris*" is not correct and will have to be substituted by another.

Votes: In favour of conservation **7**; Against conservation **0**.

Matteuccia Todaro, Giorn. Sci. Nat. Econ. Palermo **1**: 235. 1866.
T.: *M. struthiopteris* (L.) Todaro

Struthiopteris Hall. Hist. Stirp. Helv. **3**: 6. 1768.
T.: not designated by the author.
Struthiopteris Willd. Mag. Ges. Nat. Fr. Berlin **3**: 160. 1809.
T.: *S. germanica* Willd.
Pteretis Raf. Am. Monthly Mag. Crit. Rev. **2**: 268. 1818.
T.: *Struthiopteris germanica* Willd.
[*P. struthiopteris* (L.) Nieuwland].

Votes: In favour of conservation **7**; Against conservation **0**.

Pellaea Link, Fil. Sp. 59. 1841.
T.: *P. atropurpurea* (L.) Link

Platyloma J. Sm. Journ. Bot. **4**(27): 160. 1841.
T.: *P. Brownii* J. Sm. [*P. paradoxa* (R. Br.) Hk.]

Votes: In favour of conservation **7**; Against conservation **0**.

Phlebodium (R. Br.) J. Sm. Journ. Bot. **4** (26): 58. 1841.
T.: *P. aureum* (L.) J. Sm.

Chrysopteris Link, Fil. Sp. 120. 1841.
T.: *C. aurea* (L.) Link

Votes: In favour of conservation **2**; Against conservation, since *Phlebodium* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **4**; Abstention **1**.

Phyllitis Hill, Brit. Herb. 525 cum tab. 1756; Ludwig, Inst. Hist. Phys. Regn. Veg. ed. 2. 142. 1757; Gleditsch ex Scop. Fl. Carniol. 171. 1760.
T.: *P. scolopendrium* (L.) Newm.

Scolopendrium Adans. Fam. **2**: 20. 1763.
T.: *S. vulgare* Sm.

Votes: In favour of conservation **0**; Against conservation, since *Phyllitis* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **6**; Abstention **1**.
Voting on the author's name of *Phyllitis* has given the following result: Votes in favour of *Hill* **2**, in favour of *Ludwig* **2**, abstentions **3**.

Platycerium Desv. Mém. Soc. Linn. Paris **6**: 213. 1827.
T.: *P. stemaria* (Beauv.) Desv.

Alcicornium Gaudich. in Freycin. Voy. Bot. 48. 1826.
T.: *A. bifurcatum* (Cav.) Underw.

Votes: In favour of conservation **0**; Against conservation, since *Platycerium* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **7**. — 1 vote against the typification of *Platycerium* on *P. stemaria* [*P. alcicorne* (Sw.) Desv. is substituted for it] and against the typification of *Alcicornium* on *A. bifurcatum*.

Polystichum Roth, Tent. Fl. Germ. **3**: 31, 69. 1799, partim; Schott, Gen. Fil. *pl.* 9. 1834.
T.: *P. lonchitis* (L.) Roth.

Hypopeltis Michx. Fl. Bor. Amer. **2**: 266. 1803.
T.: *H. lobulata* Bory

Votes: This name was studied by the Subcommittee which rejected the proposal for conservation with **5** votes against conservation and **2** in favour [see Taxon **2** (1): 12. 1953], since *Polystichum* does not need conservation being in accordance with the Code. Since *R. Mansfeld* (Member of the Subcommittee for Phanerogams) sent to the Secretary (in litteris 26 Feb. 1953) a report on this generic name and asked him for a new voting. The case of this name was taken into consideration again by the Subcommittee with the following result: Votes in favour of conservation **0**; Against conservation, since the name

Polystichum [T.: *P. lonchitis* (L.) Roth] is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **5**; Against conservation **1**; Abstention **1**.

Pyrrosia Mirbel, Hist. Nat. Pl. **4**: 70. 1803; Hist. Nat. Vég. **3**: 471, **5**: 91. 1803.
T.: *P. chinensis* Mirbel [*P. lingua* (Thunb.) Farwell].

Candollea Mirbel, Hist. Nat. Pl. **4**: 69. 1803; Hist. Nat. Vég. **3**: 471, **5**: 86. 1803.
T.: *C. longifolia* (Burm. f.) Mirbel

Votes: In favour of conservation **1**; Against conservation, since *Pyrrosia* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **6**.

Scolopendrium Adans. Fam. **2**: 20. 1763.
T.: *S. vulgare* Sm.

Phyllitis Hill, Brit. Herb. 525 cum tab. 1756; Ludwig, Inst. Hist. Phys. Regn. Veg. ed. 2. 142. 1757.
T.: *P. scolopendrium* (L.) Newm.

Votes: In favour of conservation **0**; Against conservation **6**; Abstention **1**.

Sphenomeris Maxon, Journ. Washingt. Acad. Sci. **3**: 144. 1913.
T.: *S. clavata* (L.) Maxon

Stenoloma Fée, Gen. Fil. 330. 1852.
T.: *S. dumosum* Fée

Votes: In favour of conservation **4**; Against conservation, since *Sphenomeris* is in accordance with the Code and does not need to be conserved **1**; Against conservation **2**. — 1 vote against the typification of *Stenoloma* on *S. dumosum* [*S. clavatum* (L.) Fée is substituted for it].

Struthiopteris Hall. Hist. Stirp. Hel. **3**: 6. 1768, emend. Willd. Mag. Ges. Nat. Fr. Berlin **3**: 160. 1809.
T.: *S. germanica* Willd.

Struthiopteris Scop. Fl. Carniol. 168. 1760.
T.: *S. spicant* (L.) Weis
Struthopteris Bernh. Schrad. Journ. **1800**(2): 126. 1801.
T.: Not designated by the author.
Pteretis Raf. Am. Monthly Mag. Crit. Rev. **2**: 268. 1818.
T.: *Struthiopteris germanica* Willd.
Matteuccia Todaro, Giorn. Sci. Nat. Econ. Palermo. **1**: 235. 1866.
T.: *M. struthiopteris* (L.) Todaro

Votes: In favour of conservation **0**; Against conservation **7**.

* * *

By the present and the previous voting [see Taxon **2** (1): 12. 1953] all the generic names of Pteridophyta proposed for conservation have been examined by the Subcommittee for the Nomenclature of Pteridophyta. The result of the Subcommittee's voting can be summarized as follows:

1) The Subcommittee has approved as *Nomina Conservanda* the following generic names [their type species and the names rejected in their favour are quoted above and in Taxon **2** (1): 12. 1953]: *Anemia* Sw., *Angiopteris* Hoffm., *Araiostegia* Copel., *Cheilanthes* Sw., *Coniogramme* Fée, *Danaea* Smith, *Drymoglossum* Presl, *Gleichenia* Smith, *Lygodium* Sw., *Matteuccia* Todaro, *Pellaea* Link, *Schizaea* Smith, *Sphenomeris* Maxon.

2) The Subcommittee has rejected the proposals for the conservation of the following names: *Aspidium* Sw., *Ctenopteris* Blume, *Hymenolepis* Kaulf., *Lastrea* Bory, *Scolopendrium* Adans., *Struthiopteris* Hall.

3) The Subcommittee has rejected the proposals for the conservation of the following names, since they are in accordance with the Code and do not need to be conserved [The type species adopted for each genus by the Subcommittee are quoted above]: *Cryptogramma* R. Br., *Phlebodium* (R. Br.) J. Sm., *Phyllitis* Hill; Ludwig, *Platycerium* Desv., *Polystichum* Roth, *Pyrrosia* Mirbel.

The Secretary of the Subcommittee
Rodolfo E. G. Pichi-Sermolli

THE CAPE BELLADONNA LILY*

by

R. A. Dyer (Pretoria)

The name *Amaryllis Belladonna* was first published in Linn. Sp. Plantarum. 1753, p. 293. The description ran as follows:

> Amaryllis Belladonna spatha multiflora, corollis campanulatis, aequalibus genetalibus declinatis. Hort. Cliff. 135. Roy. lugdb. 36.
> Lilio Narcissus polyanthos flore incarnato: fundo ex luteo ablescente. Sloan. jam. 115 hist. 1. p. 244. Seb. thes. 1. p. 25. t. 17. f. 1.
> Lilium rubrum Merian. ferin. 22. t. 22.
> Habitat in Caribaeis, Barbados, Surinama.

Some confusion existed as to the correct application of the name until Herbert published his account in an Appendix to Botanical Register in 1821. From then onwards the name *Amaryllis Belladonna* was universally accepted as correctly applied to the Cape Belladonna Lily, until Stapf queried it in Botanical Magazine 1927 under tab. 9162, and Uphof launched his campaign in 1938 for the transfer of the name to an American plant.

The title of the paper by Uphof in Herbertia vol. 5, 1938, p. 101 is "The History of Nomenclature — Amaryllis (Linn.) Herb., and Hippeastrum (Herb.)". Why "Herb." should be given as the author of *Amaryllis* with a double citation including "(Linn.)" and why it is written "(Herb.)" as the author of *Hippeastrum* is not clear, nor is it clear why the citation *A. Belladonna* (Linn.) Ait. appears on p. 101 and then again *Amaryllis Belladonna* (Ait.) and again *A. Belladonna* Ait. on p. 120. The citations are inconsistent and misleading.

It is claimed by Uphof that the synonymy and locality cited by Linnaeus (1753) show that Linnaeus referred to an American plant under the name *Amaryllis Belladonna*. Also that Aiton in Index Kewensis (1789) p. 417 was the first botanist to introduce a misunderstanding by giving the American plant a new name *A. equestris* and applying the name *A. Belladonna* to a plant of unknown origin.

It is significant that Uphof pins all his faith on the synonymy cited by Linnaeus in his Sp. Pl. 1753 and does not analyse the meaning of the type description. On p. 103 he makes the statement: "It should also be mentioned that none of the authors, cited in the works of Linnaeus have ever been doubted as to the correctness of their descriptions".

Uphof, p. 103 cites a publication by Linnaeus, 1775, containing a reference to "Amaryllis 98 dubia Mer. surin. t. 22. Corolla basi laciniarum barbatum". This is the plant subsequently named *Amaryllis equestris* by Aiton 1789, which Uphof claims is nothing else than *A. Belladonna* Linn. On p. 109 Uphof concludes (b) The plant mentioned by Linnaeus as *Amaryllis 98 dubia* and which later on was named by Aiton as *Amaryllis equestris* is *Amaryllis Belladonna* Linn.

He makes no guess as to why Linnaeus did not name the plant *A. Belladonna* in the first instance, which he should have done were Uphof's contentions sound. (See Sealy in Kew Bull. 1939 p. 57).

According to Uphof "the late great William Herbert, who undoubtedly was sincere in wanting to carry out the supposed wishes of Linnaeus patr. disregarded the authority of the first and the three succeeding editions of Species Plantarum 1753, 1762, 1764 and 1799 and followed the first edition of hortus Kewensis," Herbert [Bot. Register Appendix 1821] established the genus *Hippeastrum* to contain *Amaryllis equestris* Ait. and its known American allies.

Herbert in Amaryllidaceae, 1837 after correcting his previous misconception in 1821, was in no doubt about the plant Linnaeus had in mind when he applied the name *Amaryllis Belladonna*. pp. 144-5 "To suppose he (Linnaeus) could have alluded to a bright orange flower would be perfectly absurd. It is therefore, quite indisputable that Belladonna is the type of the Linnaean genus *Amaryllis*, and it would be an idle insult to the memory of Linnaeus to remove it without any cause."

---

* Memorandum submitted to the Special Committee for Urgent Taxonomic Needs for consideration at its meeting during the Paris Congress. It should be pointed out that the opposing view (the "American" view) is exhaustively discussed in the work of Traub and Moldenke, published in 1949 by the American Plant Life Society and entitled "Amaryllidaceae: tribe Amarylleae". (Editor).

Uphof regards these views of Herbert as "fanciful".

Herbert selected Botanical Magazine, 1804, Plate 733, as representing *Amaryllis Belladonna*. Here the Cape plant (dark pink form) was figured under the name *A. Belladonna* with synonymy by Dryander. The locality was not known, and although it was considered as probably equal to the pale form from the Cape (hence the name *A. Belladonna)* the suggestion was made that it might possibly have been from Brazil. J. Miller's plate cited in the Bot. Mag. in synonymy had the distinctive subglobose seeds of the Cape plant as opposed to the flat winged seeds of the American species *(Hippeastrum)*. A further interesting point made in the Bot. Mag. text is that "The older Botanists call its country India, which with them may mean the East Indies, South America, or even some parts of Africa."

As far as the name of the Cape Belladonna is concerned Uphof p. 109 concludes that *Callicore rosea* Link 1829 "is the only name that can be maintained" overlooking the fact that Herbert had previously placed it under the new generic name *Coburghia* if it must be excluded from *Amaryllis*.

Sealy, Kew Bull. 1939: 49, reviews the evidence submitted by Uphof. Sealy admits that the synonymy cited by Linnaeus mostly referred to the American plant but throws what is regarded as conclusive evidence against the view that the description may also refer to the American plant. The evidence is strongly in favour of assuming that Linnaeus had in mind the Cape plant when he penned his description or had the 2 plants confused in his mind. He (K.B.p. 55) derives strong support for this in the work of Phillip Miller who was a contemporary of Linnaeus, and also cites the writings of Linnaeus fil.

Sealy p. 59-60 seems to have made out a good case for his alternative no. 3 that "Linnaeus based *Amaryllis Belladonna* on the Cape Belladonna known to him as a garden plant, and misidentified with it the literature belonging to *Hippeastrum equestre*". Sealy p. 60 cites a specimen in the Clifford herbarium as the lectotype.

Sealy p. 61 reaffirms that it has been the general practice from 1821 to the present day to retain the name *Amaryllis* for *A. Belladonna* L. (the Cape Belladonna); and for that reason that species 'the only one of the nine original species now retained in the genus', was suggested as the standard species for *Amaryllis* by Hitchcock and Green (Internat. Bot. Congr. 1930, Nomencl. Prop. Brit. Bot. 145 : 1929). In 1935 the Sixth International Botanical Congress recommended "that the standard-species (species lectotypicae) of Linnaean generic names printed in International Rules, ed. 3, pp. 139-143, be adopted by botanists unless there is clear reason for rejecting any species in favour of another".

After further consideration of Herbert's work Sealy p. 64 (who had the guidance of that authority in nomenclatural problems Dr. Th. A. Sprague) concludes: "It appears that no reason exists for rejecting Hitchcock's and Green's choise of *A. Belladonna* as the standard-species (lectotype) of *Amaryllis* and it should therefore be accepted."

Uphof, Herbertia 1939 : 163(1940) gave a critical review of Sealy's paper. Again he pins his faith on the illustrations cited by Linnaeus and lodges a personal attack on Sealy. Regarding Uphof's comments on page 164 on the treatise by Dr. J. Hill, Sealy (in litt.) points out that the plant investigated by Hill was not *H. equestre* but *H. Reginae* which is still a relatively easy plant to grow, as it was in Hill's days and further that its flowers are very similar in shape to those of *Amaryllis Belladonna* (Cape), and the fact that Hill used for it the phrase-name that Linnaeus had given to *Amaryllis Belladonna* suggests that the two plants had been confused in gardens.

Uphof's further personal attack does not call for comment.

Uphof [Herbertia 13, 1946 (1948) p. 97] without knowing of Sealy's view above, makes further reference to Hill's work as confirming that Hill worked with the *American Belladonna.*

In 1948 Dr. J. B. Gouws of the University of Pretoria submitted a paper for publication in Herbertia on the "Karyology of Some South African Amaryllidaceae". This work included a reference to the Cape Belladonna under the name *Amaryllis Belladonna* but the Editor of Herbertia refused to publish the work until Dr. Gouws compromised by substituting the name *Coburgia rosea* (Lamarck) Gouws. In addition the Editor included a footnote: *"He does this however entirely on his own responsibility"* and this does not change the editorial policy in Herbertia of recognising *Brunsvigea rosea* (Lamarck) Hannibal as the closest approximation of the biological facts when the Amaryllidaceae as a whole are taken into consi-

deration as pointed out by Traub and Moldenke, p. 65. Amaryllidaceae: Tribe Amarylleae, 1949. This viewpoint is also accepted in Bailey's Manual of Cultivated Plants 1949. See also Gentes Herbarum, Vol. 8, fasc 1. May 1949: "..fortunately the controversy has been entirely resolved on the rules level".

In my review of the genus *Brunsvigia* [Dyer, Herbertia (in Plant Life) 1950, p. 64], the Editor remarked that I was "privileged to exclude the Cape Belladonna from *Brunsvigia* Heist".

In 1949 the American Plant Life Society published a work by Traub and Moldenke entitled Amaryllidaceae: Tribe Amarylleae. It is dedicated to Lamarck and Stapf "in recognition of their correct and impartial statements on the identity of the Linnean species *Amaryllis Belladonna* L." In other words Lamarck and Stapf recorded views in agreement with those of the authors.

The authors Traub and Moldenke review the problem of the identity of *Amaryllis Belladonna* L. in extenso. All the evidence which they accept is regarded as "proof" of their main contention and all the evidence which they do not accept is "error", see remarks p. 48 under Phillip Miller.

Incidentally see the reasons for the establishment of the genera *Moldenkea* and *Sanmartina* both of Traub (the Editor): Herbertia, (in Plant Life) 1951, p. 41 which are models of inconsistency in outlook.

The 1952 Herbert Medal Award Citation in Plant Life (Herbertia) 1952 reads as follows: "The Scientific world owes the eminent Dutch-American botanist, Dr. Uphof, a debt of gratitude. It was he who published his stimulating Herbertia articles in 1938 and 1940 on the correct application of the names, *Amaryllis* L. (genus) and *Amaryllis Belladonna* L. (species): Herbertia (in Plant Life) 1952, p. 8.

In 1950 I forwarded to the Chief Recorder for the 7th International Botanical Congress at Stockholm a request that the application of the name *Amaryllis Belladonna* should be clarified.

Dr. Lanjouw, Secretary of the Committee for Urgent Taxonomic Needs, agrees that some international ruling with authority seems necessary to settle the argument. He suggests that the Committee for Urgent Taxonomic Needs should coopt a representative from South Africa (myself) and a representative of the American view (Traub) and that the decision of this Committee be submitted to the Advisory Board and from there, to ensure a wide vote, to the Paris Congress in 1954 as a motion.

I take it upon myself to speak for South African botanists and I am sure we would accept as final the ruling of the Committee for Urgent Taxonomic Needs.

In viewing the problem of the correct application of the name *Amaryllis Belladonna,* consideration should be given at the same time to the proposal by Sealy p. 67 that the generic name *Hippeastrum* should be conserved for the American plants in preference to the older name *Leopoldia.*

Proposals for the Paris Congress

Proposal no. 163

Art. 45

Add: On and from 1 Jan. 1955 names of new taxa of Bryophyta (Musci and Hepaticae) are not considered as validly published unless they are accompanied by illustrations or figures showing the essential characters in addition to the description, or by a reference to a previously and effectively published illustration or figure.

Argument: Many species have been published in this group without illustrations and even some genera are based on species that have not been depicted anywhere. A trend already exists to publish illustrations together with the descriptions of new species and genera. The proposal, when accepted, will be of great help in evaluating future new taxa; in a rather large number of cases this is nearly impossible when only the descriptions are used.

Proposed by: W. D. Margadant (Wageningen).

Proposal no. 164

Art. 23

Add: When a taxon is transferred to another group with a different starting-point seriously, its name is treated as valid from the date of the first effective publication after or on the earlier of the two starting-points, except in the following cases: 1) names published in an invalid combination; 2) fossil plants; 3) names for incomplete states of the life-cycle of the plant regarded as separate taxa.

Examples: *Porella* L. and *Lycopodium* L. were published in Musci in 1753; these names are valid because they have been transferred to Hepaticae and Pteridophyta respectively. Lichenes, if considered Fungi, retain Linnaeus 1753 as starting-point. Exceptions: *Mnium trichomanis* L. 1753, now in Hepaticae, cannot be treated as a valid name, because the type-species of *Mnium* has always been grouped in Musci. The name of a taxon based on a moss-protonema and published in Algae before 1802, cannot invalidate a name in Musci, as it represents an incomplete state of the life-cycle.

Discussion. Three general solutions of the problems connected with transfers between groups with different starting-points are possible. 1.) To treat the taxon according to the grouping of each author concerned. In this case *Porella* and *Lycopodium* are invalidly published by Linnaeus. This solution is out of question, being neither accepted in the Rules nor in established custom.

2.) To treat the taxon according to the modern taxonomical concept. This seems to be the present custom, e.g. *Porella* L., *Lycopodium* L. and even *Mnium trichomanis* L. (*Calypogeia trichomanis* Corda) are all dated from 1753; names of Musci and Fungi published in other groups before the relevant starting-points are excluded. However, the present Art. 76 explicitly treats Lichens, if considered Fungi, otherwise.

3.) To chose the earlier starting-point. This is already the case for Lichens and has another analogy in Art. 6, where an important point is: any author publishing a taxon as a botanical one, gives its names a claim in botanical nomenclature. The most stressing argument for this solution in the proposal is that nomenclature should not settle a taxonomic problem, that is: limits of taxonomic groups should not be defined by nomenclature.

The proposed solution has one drawback: it validates names of groups with later starting-points when they happen to be published in another group. This risk is, it is hoped, diminished by the indication: „seriously". Special cases of doubt could be submitted to the International Bureau of Nomenclature.

Alternative: If it be preferred to choose the second solution, this could be reached by few alterations in the wording of this proposal "... transferred to a group with an earlier starting-point..." and replacing the exception of fossil plants by one of Lichens.

Proposed by: W. D. Margadant (Wageningen).

Proposal no. 165*

Proposal for the conservation of the genus *Calocera* (Fr.) Fr. vs. *Corynoides* S. F. Gray.

Nom. cons. prop. *Calocera* (Fr.) Fr. (Syst. Orb. veg. 91. 1825) ex Fr., Elench. 1: 233. 1828.

T.: *Clavaria viscosa* Pers. ex Fr.

Nom. rej. prop. *Corynoides* S. F. Gray, Nat. Arrang. Brit. Pl. 1: 654. 1821.

T.: *Clavaria cornea* Batsch.

Information and argumentation: submitted to the Rapporteur.

Proposed by: M. A. Donk (Bogor).

Proposal no. 166*

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Holomitrium* Endlicher (1836) (Musci).

Proposed by: W. D. Margadant (Wageningen).

Proposal no. 167*

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Amblyodon* Bruch, Schimper & Gümbel (1841) (Musci).

Proposed by: W. D. Margadant (Wageningen).

Proposal no. 168*

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Pleuropus* Griffith (1845) (Musci).

Proposed by: W. D. Margadant (Wageningen).

Proposal no. 169*

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Saccogyna* Dumortier (1822) (Hepaticae).

Proposed by: W. D. Margadant (Wageningen).

Proposal no. 170*

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Grimaldia* Raddi (1818) (Hepaticae).

Proposed by: W. D. Margadant (Wageningen).

---

* The proposals marked with an asterisk were received after 1 Dec. 1953. Their argumentation will be (partly) published in one of the forthcoming issues of Taxon.

Proposal no. 171*

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name 1964 *Conocephalus* Blume (1825) (Moraceae).

Proposed by: W. D. Margadant (Wageningen).

Proposal no. 172*

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Woodsia* R. Br. (1810, corr. 1815).

Proposed by: H. P. Fuchs (Basel).

Proposal no. 173*

Proposal for the conservation of the generic name *Woodia* Schlechter (1894) (Apocynaceae).

Proposed by: H. P. Fuchs (Basel).

Office

The International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.

Membership Fees

Members are requested to pay their membership fees to the regional treasurers.

Members in countries without regional treasurers are requested to make payable their subscriptions to *Messrs Vlaer & Kol, Utrecht, Netherlands,* crossed: *"a.c. International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy".*

	$	£	D.fl.	Sw.Kr.
A. Individual Persons				
Regular Members	3.—	1.1.—	11.40	15.90
Associate Members	1.—	—.7.—	3.80	5.30
B. Institutes, Societies, etc.				
Supporting Members	50.—	17.10.—	190.—	265.—
Regular Members	25.—	8.15.—	95.—	132.50
Associate Members	10.—	3.10.—	38.—	53.—

Payments can be made in any currency; remittances in other currencies than those listed above are accepted against the exchange rates of the day of payment.

TAXON

Vol. I nos 1—9, 1951—1952; Vol. II nos 1—8, 1953; Vol. III nos I—X, 1954.

Backnumbers (Vol. I no. 3 excepted) are available for all members. Those who joined the I.A.P.T. on or after 1 Jan. 1954 can buy Vol. I (no. 3 excepted) against $ 2.— and Vol. II (complete) against $ 3.— per copy. Single numbers are free for all regular members.

N.B. Vol. II consists of 8 numbers.

Regnum Vegetabile

Vol. 2. *Index Herbariorum.*

Part I *The Herbaria of the world.* Second, revised, edition, 1 January 1954.
Institutional members and regular individual members: **free.**
Others: D. fl. 13.30.

Part II *Collectors.* First instalment (A-D), 1 March 1954.
Institutional members: **free.**
Regular Individual members: D. fl. 7.60 ($ 2.—; sh. 15/-).
Others: D. fl. 14.50.

Vol. 3. *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature.*

Cheap edition, 15½ x 24 cm, buckram, 1 December 1953.
Regular individual members: D. fl. 5.50 ($ 1.40, sh. 10/-).
Others: D. fl. 10.— (Not yet available for non-members residing in the U.S.A.).

REGIONAL TREASURERS

France

Nous sommes heureux de pouvoir annoncer que M. H. Jacques—Felix (45 bis Avenue de la Belle-Gabrielle, Nogent-sur-Marne (Seine) *C.C.P. Paris 2243—12*) a bien voulu se charger de la trésorerie française de notre Association. Nos membres français sont instamment priés de verser leur *cotisations pour les années 1953 et 1954* en francs français chez M. Jacques—Felix.

"Taxon" is directed by: Prof. J. Lanjouw, Chief Editor, and Dr F. A. Stafleu, Assistant Editor. All correspondence should be sent to the International Bureau for Plant Taxonomy and Nomenclature, 106 Lange Nieuwstraat, Utrecht — Netherlands.
All members of I.A.P.T. receive "Taxon" free of charge. Copies of personal members are for private use only and should not be placed in official libraries.